The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXI, No. 1 JULY, 1949

CONTENTS

The Priest and the Blessed Mother
Archbishop Patrick A. O'Boyle 1

Pax Christi: A Crusade of Prayer for All Nations
Bishop Pierre Marie Theas 7

My First Parish . . . . *Msgr. John L. Belford* 12

The Title "Son of God" in the Synoptic Gospels
James M. Vosté, O.P. 18

The Function of the Papacy . *Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J.* 34

The Local Church and Christ's Poor *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 45

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Triple Candle on Holy Saturday 61

Praying Aloud at the Elevations 61

Wearing the Chasuble over the Surplice 62

Public Mass for Non-Catholics 63

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1949, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

The Blessing of a Grave in a Non-Catholic Cemetery . . 63

Presence at Non-Catholic Services 64

Indulgence for Visiting the Blessed Sacrament . . . 65

ANALECTA 67

BOOK REVIEWS

Come, Follow Me! *By B. F. Marcetteau, S.S.* . . . 72

Sacred History. *By Daniel-Rops* 74

Introduction to Realistic Philosophy. *By John Wild* . . 76

Second Latin. *By Cora Carroll Scanlon and Charles L. Scanlon* 79

What Is This Catholic Action? *By Francis B. Donnelly* 79

—SPECIAL—

ORDINATION OFFER

What better way to start a newly ordained priest on the path of priestly teaching and reading than a subscription to THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. If you know of a priest who has been recently ordained, why not subscribe for him? Twelve times a year your thoughtful gift will bring renewed spiritual and intellectual inspiration, with gratitude for the giver. A Gift Card will be sent on your directive. Don't delay . . . write today. Subscription $5.00.

- - FREE - -

On all new subscriptions received before July 31st, 1949, we will include our Special Commemorative Issue of the 10th Anniversary of Pope Pius XII. This issue separately sells for $1.00. Subscriptions must state "Ordination Gift."

Address:

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

The Catholic University of America

Washington 17, D. C.

In answering advertisements please mention THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

THE PRIEST AND THE BLESSED MOTHER

A priest no more needs argument and persuasion to exhibit the deepest filial devotion to the Mother of Christ than he needs convincing about the duty of filial piety to his own mother. By the grace of God he loves the Blessed Virgin Mary, as by nature he loves his mother, and both come to him as spontaneously as breathing. He has his mother's picture and a thousand stored up memories to keep that relationship dear to him, and likewise he has numberless daily reminders, in the Office and the Mass and the days of the festivals, to keep the name of Mary on his lips and stir up the love of Mary in his heart.

In this, he is not divorced from realities by the affections of the heart, but rather for every point of priestly devotion to Mary he finds firm foundation and high sanction in the august dogma of the Divine Motherhood. If also he seeks for splendid example of this priestly association with Mary, he is ever mindful that the first One to exhibit devotion to Mary and to be described as "subject to Her" is the Word of God, his Great High Priest ample warrant for his own affection and subjection to Mary. He preaches devotion to Mary to all others, and with the most enthusiastic encouragement, and even the admonition of Holy Mother Church, but its first fruits ought, in the very nature of his special relationship with Mary, to be in his own personal life as a priest. For it must of necessity spring from a profound awareness of the nearness of the Mother of Christ to all who share His priesthood, near in a way that no other Christians may be said to be associated with Mary. That truth is inseparable from the priestly mind—our priesthood is but a sharing in His, and to that extent Mary's Divine Motherhood extends to us in a unique filial adoption.

Of course, the important thing for us in this respect is not some barren satisfaction in this dignity of ours which places us so close to the throne of Grace—content to regard the truth of unique priestly relationship with Mary. For, like a good many truths, this truth is ordered to action and living. Otherwise it is merely something which the mind knows, but which lies dormant there. It is rather a truth which must move the heart and the will for our own spiritual good and the profit of others. That is to say, it

must be made to exhibit its values in the practical art of priestly sanctification and ministry.

It is a law of Physics that the nearer one approaches the source of light the greater is the intensity of the light. It is also a law of the spiritual life that the nearer one is to Christ the greater must be the spiritual results that such nearness produces in the soul. If the Apostle could say with holy assurance "Be ye imitators of me as I also am of Christ" (*I Cor.* 4:16), the Blessed Virgin could say that with all the more authority, for she is the perfect masterpiece of the divine art, the only human creature who has never for a moment known the awful need of God's forgiveness. Yet it also remains true that every priest lies under the heavy obligation of being in that kind of a spiritual condition, in which he can stand before his people and say also "Be ye imitators to me." For this is simply to assert that one's life is so completely what Christ wills it to be in following Him, that, lacking the wonderful reality of His physical presence as once He walked among men, it will suffice to imitate the priest who stands before them with spiritual authority and bids them in accents of holy invitation and injunction "Imitate me." There is no shadow of arrogance in such words coming from the Apostle or Mary, or for that matter from a sincere priest. There is a calm assurance, accompanied by the saving recognition that whatever grace or spiritual gift makes one capable of issuing such an invitation, is always referred to its proper source. For Mary it is acknowledged in the flaming words, "He that is mighty hath wrought great things in me", while for St. Paul, "It is God Who works in us, both to will and to accomplish" (*Phil.* 2:13). In Mary as in the great Apostle of the Gentiles there is the concrete evidence of what the grace of God can produce in a soul utterly responsive and wholeheartedly given to the service of God in inviolable friendship and love.

On the day of ordination, we priests make our initial profession of total obedience, the generous act of a free will, giving self unreservedly to God, and binding ourselves thenceforth to all that this high vocation demands of us, inviolate chastity, enlightened faith, firm hope and inflaming charity, and all the rest. In our first obedience we have the imitation of the primary offering of Mary. For she consented not only to the miracle of the Incarnation, but to all that was woven inextricably into the giant framework

of the great design of Redemption. Nothing was held back in the way of private exceptions from that first and full surrender of herself, "Be it done unto me according to thy word." This is true abandonment, loving, confident, and trustful. It is born of the unshakeable faith that even beyond the periphery to which our limited human knowledge will take us with certainty concerning the holy will of God, nothing escapes the all-embracing sweep of the Divine Mind and the decisions of the Divine Will. There is no arrogant weighing of the Wisdom of God, no pitting one's mind against the mind of God in the arrangement of the universe, as if God must await the intellectual endorsement of the human mind before whom He lays the decisions of His will. There is a vast need for that kind of holy abandonment, especially in the troubled hours when She beholds Jesus, Who has been named by the Angel of the Annunciation, "Son of the Most High God," treated as merely man, tired, hungry, hunted, despised, lashed like a criminal, impaled in dishonor and dying in woe and desolation. She never faltered in her faith, even when she alone might truly be said to have preserved the faith in His divinity, when the shadows lengthened over the Cross and all others had fled in terror from the hill. We priests need that kind of unflagging faith when life brings us disappointment and failure and merciless pain; never for a moment becoming weak or inconstant, yielding to what overwhelms us, knowing that "God is faithful"—remembering too what the Apostle faithfully proclaimed in his agony, "I fill up what is wanting of the sufferings of Christ," regarding it as privilege to drink of the cup of the King.

Our priesthood is not something imposed upon us without our free offering for such service. There is no assumption of obligations until first we have made the offering and it has been divinely accepted. But from that moment the stern debt of duty and justice begins, and remains unalterable, the rigor of that justice which demands that what has been given to God shall be rendered to God. In this wise we are like Mary, "Fiat." With us, as with Her, there never could be withdrawal of diminution of the offering. It may, God knows, mean, many times, descent into the dark night of faith and of charity, just as the obedience of Mary brought her to the abyss of sorrows, just as the obedience of Christ led Him to the darkness of the Garden and the tears and Blood of the

Agony. Yet the duty endures, for behind it there is the avowal "Thou hast formed Me a body and behold I come. . . . It is written of Me at the head of the Book that I should Thy Will, O God" (*Heb.* 10:5-9). So often this life of ours is one of noble deeds done in obscurity, labors hidden from all witness except the vision of God. In this we can be content like Mary to remain unnoticed, confident that no smallest thing escapes the providential action which gathers into the divine barns the fruits of men's lives for ultimate and infallible evaluation.

It is not only a pattern of holiness that we priests can find in Mary. We can find also profitable directions for action. Are we not the custodians of the Real Body of Christ in the Holy Eucharist, which the Council of Trent reminds us is "the Body born of the Blessed Virgin Mary?" Our altars are rightly called "another Bethlehem," repositories of the "living Bread, given for the life of the world." (*John* 6:33). Tragically enough, our altars can also be like the prison under the house of Annas the high priest of old, where the Lord knew abandonment by His own and contempt from the stranger and unbeliever. There is in the Holy Eucharist a display of pathetic dependence and helplessness like the revival of the infancy of Jesus Christ, and, with this, a divinely established guardianship for ourselves by whose priestly power His Real Presence is renewed. Here is the intimacy of friend with Friend, where the Child "is found with His Mother," where the priest is in the presence of his High Priest. But there is also the duty of clean sanctuaries and reverent care, spotless linens and vessels, and unremitting visits and adoration. The Holy Mother can teach us that kind of reverent care. Thence we have a special reason for often repeating the indulgenced prayer, "Our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament, Model and Mother of Adorers, Pray For Us." It would and it should be a deeply troubling and disturbing thought that Our Lord might conceivably prefer the grim poverty of the rude shelter of the cave at Bethlehem, where He lay upon straw and was surrounded by reverence and love, to the grandeur of our churches and marble altars, where He might dwell carelessly unregarded.

The priest must live in a very real association with Mary, not regarding her only as a lovable and faraway ideal. The motherhood of Mary in respect to the priest is a real motherhood of a

special kind, just as the Divine Motherhood is a dogma that states reality and fact. The priest must act upon that sanctifying conviction, not only to be spiritually formed himself, but to rely upon Mary's cooperation in a very real way for the fruition of his priesthood in action. Even the ordinary acts of his daily life can be highly meritorious, and the more so if they are offered through Mary and for Mary, whence they take on increased value and degree of holiness by becoming hers. There is no action in the priestly life which cannot be enhanced by such intentional association, the celebration of Mass, the preaching of the Gospel, work of instruction, all the actions of a vigorous ministry. I do not think that there could be any doubt that a priest, so dedicated to the Blessed Virgin, Mother of the priesthood, would be spiritually most productive and effective in extending the kingdom of Christ over human souls. The facts of such spiritual efficiency are indubitable in the history of the Church where priests work hand in hand with the loyal "handmaiden" of the priesthood. Father Faber could so truthfully assert "Let a man but try it for himself and his surprise at the grace it brings and the transformation it causes will very soon convince him of its otherwise almost incredible efficacy as a means for the salvation of souls and for the coming of the Kingdom of Christ."

The priestly life and ministry, carried on under what one may rightly call "Marian Law," cannot be otherwise than a profitable and sanctifying way of walking humbly with God. If we, the poor banished children of Eve cry out to Mary, "After this our exile show unto us Jesus", it is because God Himself elected and adorned Her as His living ostensorium. She was fashioned by the divine art to show forth God in the humility of human infancy. We, too, show forth God in the humility of our common bread in the elevation of the Holy Mass, but more especially we have to do so in the lives we lead, by which other men may be won to the imitation of Christ. There must be in us that which truly manifests God within us, which influences and urges men imperiously to that kind of a way of life. To show forth Christ in our own priestly way is certainly the test by which our lives will be judged, and for which the reward is the Vision of God at the end. We here on earth are like the shepherds led by divine light to where God dwells, and where we say as we approach daily the threshold of the everlasting Bethlehem,

"Show unto us Jesus." Our constant invocation each day is expressed in the prayer of Prime "Sancta Maria et omnes sancti intercedant pro nobis ad Dominum, etc." and more pointedly still in the prayer of Father Olier, S.S.

"O Jesus Living in Mary come and live in Thy Servant
In the spirit of Thy sanctity:
In the fullness of Thy powers:
In the reality of Thy virtues:
In the perfection of Thy ways:
In the communion of Thy mysteries:
Rule over me and repress all that is rebellious within me
unto the glory of the Father."

✠ PATRICK A. O'BOYLE
Archbishop of Washington

OUR LADY AND CHRISTIAN UNITY

Trust Mary, supplicate her. That the one selfsame profession of faith may unite the minds of Christian nations in peace and harmony, that the one and only bond of perfect charity may gather their hearts within its embrace—in these things we find a new and ardently desired adornment for religion and something which it will be within her power to gain for us. And remembering that her only-begotten Son prayed so earnestly to His heavenly Father for the closest union among the nations He has called by the one baptism to the one inheritance of salvation which has been bought at an infinite price, will she not see to it that, in His marvelous light, all will strive as with one mind for unity? And will it not be her wish to employ her goodness and her providence to console the Church, the Spouse of Christ, through her long-sustained efforts in this work and to bring to full perfection the boon of unity among the members of the Christian family, the illustrious fruit of her motherhood?

. . . Mary will be the happy bond to draw together, with strong yet gentle constraint, all who love Christ, no matter where they may be, to form a nation of brothers yielding obedience to the Vicar of Christ on earth, the Roman Pontiff, their common Father.

—Pope Leo XIII in the encyclical *Adiutricem populi,* issued Sept. 5, 1895.

PAX CHRISTI
A CRUSADE OF PRAYER FOR ALL NATIONS

His Grace, the Most Reverend John T. McNicholas, Archbishop of Cincinnati, has asked me to write an article on *Pax Christi* for *The American Ecclesiastical Review.*

I deeply appreciate the honor conferred upon me in being asked to do this. I am happy to be able to comply with His Grace's wishes and to bring to the attention of the American clergy a movement which, in my judgment, is destined to work most efficiently for the establishment of peace under Christ in the world.

In order to understand the movement *Pax Christi,* it is necessary to know its history, its doctrine, and its activity.

I
HISTORY OF *PAX CHRISTI*

1) *Origin:* During the first weeks of 1945, a few Catholic French laymen, former victims of the Nazi regime, got the idea of organizing in France a crusade of prayer for Germany. Accordingly they came to seek approbation from the author of this article, who was at that time Bishop of Montauban.

The war was not yet over; the Germans were still fighting in the Eastern part of France. Innumerable French prisoners and political refugees were dying in German camps. In the hearts of many Frenchmen there was, naturally, a growing and violent animosity against the Germans.

Despite all this, it seemed that the movement inaugurated by these pious laymen deserved approval. And so we granted it. The movement was inspired by the spirit of the Gospel which commands us to love our enemies, to pardon injuries, and to pray for those who persecute us. Thus it happened that during the first months of 1945, Christians in France, encouraged by several French Bishops, were praying for the Germans and, in particular, for the downfall of Nazism. This was the first activity of the *Pax Christi* movement.

2) *Development:* In May, 1945, the capitulation of Germany spelled the defeat of Nazism. The directors of the *Pax Christi* movement enlarged their objective and asked their members to

pray, not only for Germany, but for all nations, in order to obtain peace among all nations. Quickly the movement, encouraged by the Hierarchy, grew to great proportions. From Germany we received the most fervent and enthusiastic support.

3) *Blessing of the Holy Father:* On two occasions, the 3rd of June, 1947, and the 26th of May, 1948, His Holiness Pope Pius XII, through his substitute Secretary of State, Monsignor Montini, blessed and recommended the *Pax Christi.* "The objectives and the essentially spiritual activities of this movement, its solicitude in inspiring men to heed Pontifical directives, its rapid development, and its reception by the Hierarchy of various countries, are so many factors in disposing His Holiness to favor this movement and to grant its directors his encouragement and benediction.

"The Holy Father is pleased to know that at a time when men are working so energetically for peace—and so often in vain—the Crusade of *Pax Christi* is spreading everywhere the Christian concept of peace and creating, by the prayers of its members and the circulation of its literature, an atmosphere of universal understanding which will be the basis for a true and lasting reconciliation between men and between nations."

Such emphasis, coming from Rome, has authorized in the whole Church a Crusade of Prayer for the Family of Nations.

4) *Literature—Organization—Meetings—Pilgrimages:* In order to give proper formation, as well as information, to its members, *Pax Christi* published from the very beginning, both in French and German, a quarterly report.[1]

International meetings soon took place. In these meetings charity sought to bring together those who, in time of war, were

[1] The organization *Pax Christi* comprises the following:

a) An international committee with headquarters in France (it could be transferred to another nation), under the direction of His Eminence Cardinal Saliege, Archbishop of Toulouse. The members of the committee are: The Most Reverend Pierre Marie Theas, Bishop of Tarbes and Lourdes, president; Mme. Dortel-Claudot, secretary-general, 43 rue de Maubeuge, Paris (9); Mlle Putois, treasurer, 43 rue de Maubeuge, Paris (9).

b) In each nation, a national secretary is chosen by the Bishops.

c) In each diocese, a diocesan secretary is under the authority of the Bishop.

divided by hatred and set one against the other. These reunions, both in Germany and in France, were real victories of Christian charity.

The first international Pilgrimage of *Pax Christi* to Lourdes, in July, 1948, under the leadership of Cardinal Frings, Archbishop of Cologne; Cardinal Segura, Archbishop of Seville; and Cardinal Saliege, Archbishop of Toulouse, has been inscribed in letters of gold in the annals of international charity.

Near the end of April, in the Marian Chapel of Oropa in Italy, a new Congress of *Pax Christi* took place in anticipation of the second International Pilgrimage to Lourdes the following July, under the patronage of His Eminence Cardinal Schuster, Archbishop of Milan. In 1950, the Holy Year, *Pax Christi* will hold its annual convention in Rome.

II
DOCTRINE OF *PAX CHRISTI*

The *Pax Christi* movement strives to express and to realize the doctrine of the Church. Above all it desires to follow the directives of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, the Apostle of Peace, the Doctor of Peace, "the Martyr of Peace", as His Eminence Cardinal Spellman has so happily expressed it.[2]

Our Catholic faith teaches Christians that love of one's country should be in harmony with one's love of humanity at large. It is not a question of being less patriotic; but rather of being more catholic. No nation has unlimited rights. God is the Founder of all nations. But all men and all people, no matter what their race, language, or civilization may be, form part of the great human family. All nations therefore ought to promote the common welfare of humanity, and do everything possible that the world may live in peace and harmony. This doctrine excludes all hypernationalism; it condemns those who make of their country an idol to which every right must be sacrificed. God alone is the transcendent Being. All men are His creatures; they are nothing except through God and for God.

As the guardian and infallible interpreter of the deposit of Faith, His Holiness Pope Pius XII, only a few years ago, gave us the splendid Encyclical on the doctrine of the Mystical Body of

[2] *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, March, 1949.

Christ. The Word of God has taken on human nature in the womb of the Immaculate Virgin Mary solely to be associated with individual human beings and to unite them in the unity of His Mystical Body. The mission of Christ, our suffering Redeemer, tends to this end: "That he might gather into one the children of God who were scattered abroad." (John 11:52)

Charity, the love of God and of neighbor—of all men, even our enemies—is essential. The rest is subordinate and secondary. Such is the revealed doctrine which has been transmitted to us without interruption by Holy Mother Church. Rome is the listening post for *Pax Christi,* which draws all its knowledge and teaching on the matter of peace from the Church, analyzing it, broadcasting it, and making it a part of our lives. *Pax Christi* aims to create among its members, in whom it inspires filial love for the Father of Christendom, a mind according to the mind of the Church.

ACTIVITY OF *PAX CHRISTI*

Pax Christi is an activity that is solely spiritual. Without a doubt, the maintaining of peace demands the solution of numerous problems in the temporal order. These problems must be studied and solved. Consequently there must be international conferences, agreements, and treaties. Institutions like the O.N.U. and the U.N.E.S.C.O. are necessary. We must respect them and be of assistance to them. But the real activity of members of *Pax Christi* must be limited to the spiritual domain of prayer and charity.

Prayer is indispensable to the establishment, protection, and strengthening of peace. Men are capable of bringing war into the world, of covering the earth with death and ruin. Yet we see them powerless in establishing peace. Without God and prayer there is nothing to which we can cling. The peace that we long for is that peace that has its source in Jesus Christ, upon whom rest all Christian values of justice and charity. This peace is a gift of God, obtained by prayer. It is that unanimous and fervent prayer that *Pax Christi* would like to solicit from Christians all over the world. We ask the daily recitation of one "Hail Mary", the invocation of the Queen of Peace, and prayer to the patron saint of that nation of whom the members are citizens.

Since Peace is the daughter of Love, *Pax Christi* insists that its members practice evangelical charity, which is the love of enemies and the pardon of injuries. This charity is to be exacted

everywhere and always: in the family, in the school, in the store, in the factory, in business, in recreation, and especially in our international contacts. In answering all the demands of charity our Catholic people prepare in an efficacious manner the reign of Christian peace.

My recent travel in the United States has created in me a profound admiration for the Church of America. I especially felt that the Bishops, the clergy, the Religious and the Catholic laity were in perfect accord with the ideal of *Pax Christi.* Why this unanimity? It comes from the emphasis on spiritual values in American Catholicism, as well as from the cosmopolitan character of its population and the spirit of unity that reigns in the United States.

When this world will have sufficiently developed in the sense of unity, why should not the motto of the United States, "E pluribus unum", be enlarged upon so that the motto of all peoples on the earth might be: "Ex omnibus unum"?

✠ Pierre Marie Theas
Bishop of Tarbes and Lourdes

The Mediation of Mary

The Eternal Son of God, about to take upon Himself our nature for saving and ennobling of man, and about to consummate thus a mystical union between Himself and all mankind, did not accomplish His design without adding thereto the free consent of the chosen Mother who, in a certain manner, represented all humanity, according to the just and illustrious opinion of St. Thomas, who says that the Annunciation was effected with the consent of the Virgin standing in the place of humanity. With equal truth it may also be affirmed that, by the will of God, Mary is the intermediary through whom there is distributed unto us this immense treasure of mercies gathered by God; for mercy and truth came through Jesus Christ. Thus as no man goes to the Father but by the Son, so no man goes to Christ but by His Mother.

—Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical *Octobri mense,* issued Sept. 22, 1891.

MY FIRST PARISH

I have had three and a fraction. You will say, *"A fraction!* Please explain." While I was in charge of an old and rather large parish, there came an opportunity to buy a nearby Protestant church. It would accommodate some six hundred people and save them, and especially their children, from crossing a busy avenue on which several lines of surface cars ran and not infrequently killed or injured the careless. With the aid of another assistant, we could easily be of service and at little expense in this nearby building.

We had a surplus in our bank and we borrowed the rest. After one year, the Bishop thought it could live and thrive independently. It could, and it did. So we handed it over to a "genius" who made extensive improvements, involving a heavy debt which could have been avoided had he been patient. In that one year, we had reduced the debt by some $13,000 and paid for the necessary changes in the interior. So, that is what I mean by a fraction. It involved more trouble than a new building and became more of a "fracture" than a fraction.

To a priest, his first parish is what a first child is to a mother. He never forgets it, particularly if he is the founder. No one ever appreciates what does not cost trouble, pain, or expense.

My first parish came when I was eight years ordained. Six of those years were spent in the parish in which I was born and where I was an altar boy. In it, I made my first Communion, received Confirmation, and preached my first sermon. To the pastor, I was always "a kid." He did not want me to leave and the thought of going made me ill.

My first assignment after that was school work. I knew nothing about it, but I learned much in two years. I was a pioneer. Our schools had never had diocesan supervision, and pastors and teachers resented interference. In fact, the more they needed it, the more they disliked it. But we managed to make some progress and to make more friends than enemies, though we made enough of the latter.

I was not surprised to receive a note calling me to see the Bishop. I was prepared to be told, "You can be steward no longer." In fact, I hoped to hear it, but I did not dream that I was to get a

parish. I thought he would say, "You need experience. While you have done well in the schools, I have an older priest who has a degree and I think he will be better received by the pastors." Of course, I knew that I was being "kicked upstairs." It was a bit painful, but I welcomed the change, though it meant more pioneering.

His Excellency concluded: "I am going to send you to a small village on Long Island. The people are few and scattered. They have a small church, but they have never had a resident pastor. Priests from the adjoining villages have said Mass there every Sunday. They have done what they could. But it is time to give them a pastor of their own. You will have to build a church much larger than the present one and procure property adequate for that, a residence and, later on, for a school and a convent. They have three thousand dollars. It took twenty-five years to get that and they think it will provide the land. But you will have to raise funds for the necessary buildings. You will have to struggle. But I hope the place will grow. In the meantime, we cannot assure you of any salary. You will get a living, but that is all we can promise. If you need help, let me know, and I will see that you do not want. The place is Oyster Bay. God bless you! Good bye!"

I left the Bishop's house and found my way home. But how I made it, I do not know. I felt like a fellow who had asked a girl to marry him, hoping that she would say, "No," only to hear her say, "Yes; when?"

I told my former boss and old friend. He nearly jumped. "Confound it!" he said, "just when you were getting useful, he sends you into the woods. What shall I do?" I said, "You might come down with me and look for the place and tell me how to start in."

Next day, being Election Day, I set out *alone*. "Go and take a look at it," the boss said, "then we'll talk it over." Talk about cold comfort! He was like a cake of ice and just as useful.

Well, I got the surprise of my life. On the train, I met two parishioners. They had summer homes in the village and they had been begging for a pastor. They were very kind. They said, "Welcome!" And I think they meant it. Anyway, it sounded good.

They told me the place was beautiful. It was, and it is. It is on a bay, opening into Long Island Sound. Surrounded by

wooded hills; it is charming to look at for six months of the year. But it has a long and dreary winter.

My angels took me to see the chapel and drove me about to see the village and some of the people. The church was some forty years old. It was not an architectural wonder. Neither was it a ruin, though it needed paint and sundry repairs. It stood on a back street and was built on a lot just large enough to make it impossible to enlarge the building and the sheds needed to protect the horses in bad weather. What it really needed was a fire.

Bear in mind, we are talking of November, 1895. It was the horse and buggy era, when dirt roads were called good and automobiles were curiosities. Many started, but few returned without assistance. People did not count it hardship to walk to Mass when the church was five miles away. Indeed, we had evening services every Sunday and in Lent, May, June, and October. Many came, walking morning and evening. They loved their religion and their little church was dear to them. For years it had been their comfort, if not exactly their pride. They hungered for sermons and Benediction.

My first work was to find a house or a room. The only one I could find was in the home of a Methodist family, who, for eight dollars a week, agreed to supply me with bed and board until I could build a modest cottage for myself.

These good people did all they could to assure our neighbors that the "new priest" was all right. They did more to promote charity and friendship than I did or could do.

I left Oyster Bay after four happy years and I shall never forget the people there.

MY FIRST NIGHT IN THE PARISH

On my first visit, I met some of the parishioners. They told me the best time for Sunday Mass and I arranged to arrive on Saturday and be ready for work on Sunday. I engaged a room in the inn. The inn was old and none too clean or comfortable. I had supper. It was not much in quantity or quality. But I had ahead of me a fast from 6:00 p. m. on Saturday until noon on Sunday. I enjoyed the meal more than the bed. My room was over the bar room. That was a noisy place. Perhaps the natives were celebrat-

ing my arrival and, again, perhaps they were trying to drive me out of the village.

Morning came and, with a heavy heart and a pair of wet feet, I made my way to the church. It was raining and the roof was leaking in a dozen places. Many windows were paneless, but the people said that they were used to it. The caretaker had the church door open and a fire in the stove. For music, we had the drip of the rain and the howling of the wind. There were about fifty people in the pews for the first Mass. What we lacked in comfort, we made up in fervor.

At ten o'clock we had a second Mass, and a sermon on the Sowing of the Seed. They were attentive and some came up to say, "hello," and bid me welcome. All hoped they would soon have a new church. I need not say I assured them that repairs would start Monday and a new church would be there as soon as I could build it.

Before Mass, one of the parishioners told me, "You will have to take up the collection yourself. If you don't, they won't give you anything." Cheerful as this advice was, I made up my mind, "*That* is one thing I will *not* do!" So I said, "Please take it up today; later on I may have to do it."

At the later Mass, the church was filled. Again, I was advised to collect, and I gave the same answer. After Mass, the caretaker handed me a cigar-box containing ten dollars in coin and remarked, "the best collection we ever got at this time of the year!" I thanked him and, as I went to breakfast, I kept saying to myself: "Yes! That *is* fine! All I have to do is buy a piece of land large enough for the parish of the future; build a church and house, a school and a convent; live on the fine air, and pay all the cost of this, plus maintenance! I have three thousand dollars to start with! It has taken twenty-five years for the congregation to amass that fortune! Today, I got ten dollars! Tomorrow, I give eight dollars for my week's board! Take off your coat and go to work! Add two dollars to the three thousand! But do not forget to allow for money to run the church and house! You will have to eat, pay for supplies, buy clothing, pay wages, taxes, insurance, repairs. Yes, you are lucky! Fling out the flag and tell the world how to build up a parish on two dollars a week!"

That gave me an appetite. Yes, it made me grit my teeth and say, "No, I will not take up collections. If the people do not give, I will not force them." And I did not. In four years, they gave me about $50,000. They had a fine piece of property, a church which cost $20,000, and a furnished rectory which cost about $8,000. The only debt was a mortgage of $10,000.

This was the moral of the story. People love truth. They love facts. They want to know why and how. They want their pastor to consult them, to lead them—not drive them, to make them feel that he depends on them. Tell them this:

"This is *your* church. *You* are building it *for God* and for *your children.* The pastor is your treasurer. He uses what you contribute. He gets a house to live in, food to sustain him, and a salary to clothe him. He works for you just as the sexton and housekeeper work for you. If you believe me, let's go! If you don't believe me, get someone else, one whom you can believe and with whom you are willing to work.

"Here, then, is my plan. Figure out your income. See how much you can spare for your parish. Agree to give me a fair share of that to spend for you on the parish. Set aside a dollar or five or ten dollars a month, if you can spare it; enclose it in an envelope which you will put in the basket on Sunday. On that envelope, we shall print: 'Monthly Subscription for the Parish,' and there will be a place for your name and one for the amount enclosed. In a day or so, you will receive a card acknowledging your gift and, once a month, a printed list giving your name but *not the amount* you have contributed.

"This is my plan. It is subject to change as circumstances require. Please keep this in mind. *I will not take up collections either here or in the city.* You want a church. When I know how much you want it, I shall know how much I can spend on it. Don't think you can have a one hundred thousand dollar church! Nickels and dimes will not build or support a parish."

Well, we tried the plan with modifications, but without collecting in or out of the church or the diocese.

Yes, it will work in the city. It will work anywhere. Some forty years ago, I took charge of a city parish in which there was a large debt and a small income. The existing church and school were

too small. The rectory and convent needed repairs. We had to buy more land.

The first thing to do was to increase the debt by borrowing twenty-five thousand dollars and making necessary repairs. We tried the plan. Within five years, I could tell the Bishop, "We are out of debt!" In five years more we began a new church and convent. It took two years to build them, but when the church was dedicated, it could have been consecrated.

This is written in no boastful spirit. I have never lost sight of the Psalm that tells us: "Unless the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it."

This article was inspired in an after-dinner talk with a few fellow priests. They urged me to write it. They convinced me that it might encourage some younger brothers to tackle a tough job when they found one.

To the timid soul I would say: "Do not sit down and moan or groan. Get down on your knees and ask God to bless you with courage, light and strength. Tell your people the truth. Do not scold them or impose upon them. The days of miracles have not passed. They will never pass. The Lord has said, 'I am with you all days!'"

MSGR. JOHN L. BELFORD

Brooklyn, N. Y.

THE CHURCH AS SEEN IN THE LIGHT OF HISTORY

The Church is seen in history to be the great civilising power in the world, the great teacher and educator, the inspirer of true art and architecture and poetry, the protector and patron of learning. A study of the life history of her most illustrious Popes, of the work of religious Orders, and of the foundation and rise of European universities, reveals the Church as she really is. A right understanding of the lives of many of the Saints, and of what Europe owes to them, will increase this admiration for the Church, the inspirer and teacher of all true sanctity.

—The late Msgr. Peter Guilday, in his *Introduction to Church History* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1925), p. 132.

THE TITLE "SON OF GOD" IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

We are restricting the examination of this title to the Synoptic Gospels,[1] because in regard to the Pauline Epistles and the Johannine Gospel there is no doubt about the transcendental (as some say) or the supra-human meaning of the title "Son of God" which has been applied to Jesus, Our Lord and Saviour.

But before we take up the testimonies of the Synoptists, it is necessary that we first see what was the usage and the meaning of this title in the Old Testament. For the title "son of God," if considered according to the nature of the Hebrew language, can presuppose, *a priori,* some relation to the participated divine nature; for example, the relation of the work of a legate or of the mission, of entrusted authority, of special love and protection, etc.

THE OLD TESTAMENT

The title "son of God" appears in the various books of the Old Testament both in the singular and plural number.

(1) *Angels.* In Gen. 6:2 we read: "The *sons of God* seeing the daughters of men, that they were fair, took to themselves wives." The broad meaning is evident, but the special significance is highly controversial. The earlier Fathers and ecclesiastical writers held that the "sons of God" (*benē hā 'Elohīm*) in this passage meant *angels.* St. Augustine is the first to regard the "sons of God" as the *Sons of Seth.*[2] About this opinion P. Lagrange

[1] Cf. M. Lepin, *Jésus Messie et Fils de Dieu d'après les Évangiles Synoptiques* (Paris, 1904; 4th ed., 1910). A. Cellini, *Il valore del titolo "Figlio di Dio" nella sua attribuzione a Gesù presso gli Evangeli sinottici* (Rome, 1907). These two learned volumes delve deeply into the past and are therefore by no means light reading for modern students. Other works that may be consulted are: G. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu* (Leipzig, 1898; X, "Der Sohn Gottes," 219-37); V. Rose, *Études sur les Évangiles* (Paris, 1902; ed. 4, 1904; VI, "Fils de Dieu," 183-214); H. Lesêtre, "Fils de Dieu," in *Dict. Bibl. Vig.,* II, col. 2253-57; W. Sanday, *Son of God,* in Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible,* IV, 570-79; P. Van Imschoot, Zoon Gods in *Bybelsch Woordenboek* (Roermond, 1941), col. 1646-57.

[2] Cf. C. Robert, "Les fils de Dieu et les filles de l'homme," *Revue Biblique,* IV (1895), 340-73; 525-52; for the opinions of the Fathers see the conclusions on p. 365. G.-M. Perrella, I "figli di dio" e le "figlie dell'uomo," Gen. VI, 2-4; *Divus Thomas* (Piacenza, 1933), 435-50, to which reference is made by H.

makes the following keen observation: "Il est clair que ce n'est pas de l'exégèse littérale qu'est sortie l'opinion qui fait des fils de Dieu des Séthites. On y est arrivé, contraint et forcé, par le postulat rationnel de l'incorporéité des anges." [3] This indeed can be true for St. Augustine and other theologians; in fact recent exegetes, such as Perrella, Junker, and Ceuppens, who endorse this opinion, come to their conclusion solely on the basis of the literary and historical context, which seems to favor the "pious Sethites."

Less doubtful, may I say altogether certain, is the meaning of this title that must be applied to angels in Job 1:6; for here there is a question of the heavenly court and the assessors of God: "On a certain day, when the *sons of God* (*benē hā-'Elohīm*) came to stand before the Lord, Satan also was present among them." Almost the same is read in Job 2:1. Consult also Job 38:7, where there is a question of the work of the Creator and His heavenly praisers: "When the morning stars praised me [God] together, and all the *sons of God* (*benē-'Elohīm*) shouted for joy."

The same meaning seems to be in Psalm 28 (Heb. 29):1: "Ascribe to the Lord, *O sons of God* (*benē 'Elīm*), ascribe to the Lord glory and power;" [4] likewise in Psalm 88 (Heb. 89):7: "For who among the clouds can be compared to the Lord, who is like unto the Lord among *the sons of God?*"

Daniel 3:92 (Aram. 3:25) must also be consulted: "Behold I see four men loose and walking in the midst of the fire, and quite unscathed [lit., they have no hurt], and the form of the fourth is

---

Junker, "Zur Erklärung von Gen. 6, 1-4," *Biblica*, XVI (1935), 205-12; Fr. Cueppens, *De historia primaeva* (Rome, 1934), pp. 226-27; G. E. Closen, *Die Sünde der "Sohne Gottes"* (Rome, 1937); P. Joüon, "Les unions entre les 'Fils de Dieu' et les 'Filles des hommes,'" *Recherches de Science Religieuse*, XXIX (1939) 108-14; P. Van Imschoot, Zonen Gods, *Byb. Woordenboek*, col. 1642-44.

[3] *La Genèse* (Paris, 1905, Manuscript), p. 158.

[4] We quote always cite the new "clear" version of the Psalms. In the critical edition (Rome, 1945), p. 48, we read: "'filii Dei: probabiliter Angeli (cf. Ps. 88 [89], 7; Job 38, 7); sec. alios membra populi electi vel sacerdotes (cf. Ps. 81 [82], 6). In Vulgata legitur Ps. 28,1: 'Afferte Domino filii Dei, afferte Domino *filios arietum* . . .'" The latter expression, "filios arietum," is nothing less than a bad translation of the Hebrew text: *bene 'elīm;* and it provides an example (one among thousands!) that proves the necessity and the excellence of the new version.

like the son of God (*bar, 'Elāhīn*): this "son of God" seems by reason of analogy with Daniel 6:2 to be *an angel of God.*

(2) *Judges and Rulers of the People.* Those men are called gods (*'Elohīm*) who as divine representatives judge and rule the people of God in His name and by His authority. Thus for example: "God arises in the divine assembly, *in the midst of the gods* he passes sentence" (Ps. 81 [82]:1). Having rebuked the unjust judges, the Psalmist, speaking in the name of God, continues: "I said, 'You are gods, and *sons of the Most High* (*benē 'Elᵉiōn*), all of you. Yet you shall die like men, and fall like any prince,'" (Ps. 81 [82]:6,7). It is used similarly in Psalm 57 [58]:2.[5] According to the Fourth Gospel Jesus repeated some of the words of Psalm 81 [82]: "Is it not written in your Law, 'I said, you are gods'" (John 10:34).

In fact previously, in the Book of Exodus, judges were simply called gods: *hā-'elohīm* (21:6; 22:8.9.28 [Heb. 7,8,27].[6] To understand this it is necessary to delve deeply into the religious mentality and literary taste of the ancient Semites.

(3) *Theocratic King.* Of great importance is the application of this title to the theocratic king which is at the same time an introduction to messianic promises. The principal passage is the prophecy of Nathan to David: "I [the Lord speaking] will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son" (2 Sam. 7:14; cf. I Par. 22:10).

(4) *Theocratic People.* The previous concept may also be applied to the people of God. Thus the Lord commanded Moses to say to Pharao: "Thus saith the Lord: Israel is my son, my firstborn. I have said to thee: Let my son go, that he may serve me" (Ex. 4:22-23; cf. also Jer. 31:9). Here we must recall the text of Osee 11:1: "When Israel was a child, then I loved him; and out of Egypt I called my son;" this is applied in a typical manner to Christ Jesus (Matt. 2:15).

(5) *Messianic Title.* Finally, this title is ascribed in a direct messianic sense in two well-known Psalms; namely, first in Psalm

[5] Cf. the critical edition of the New Psalter, pp. 164 f. and pp. 106 ff. *Angeli* are probably called *'Elohim,* Ps. 137 (138), 1(Heb.); cf. *ibid.,* pp. 289 f.

[6] For the different uses and meanings of the word *'Elohim* consult Gesenius, *Thesaurus philologicus criticus Linguae Hebraeae et Chaldaeae V. T.* (1829), pp. 95 f.

2:7: "The Lord said to me: 'Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee,' " and this Psalm is quoted as well as explicity applied to Christ Jesus in the New Testament (Acts 4:25-26; 13:33; Heb. 1:5;5;5); secondly, in Psalm 88 [89]:27-28: "He shall call to me: 'Thou art my Father, my God and the rock of my salvation.' And I will make him the firstborn, the highest of all kings on earth." These words are directly applied to David, but refer typically to Christ.

From the above analysis both the use and the wide and varied meaning of the term, "the son of God," are evident, just as God Himself is said to be and is the Father of Israel, the Father of the just and of the poor, the Begetter of Wisdom, from which the Logos proceeds.[7]

THE NEW TESTAMENT

The primitive Aramaic title,[8] therefore, in the catechesis can designate a mere man, who participates in some manner of God's nature, favor, honor, authority, etc. This meaning is suggested and confirmed by the usage of the title in the Old Testament, and this meaning certainly occurs at times in the New Testament, as we shall shortly see.

Hence the difficulty arises in regard to the application of the title to Jesus of Nazareth: was it primitively, as applied to Jesus, merely an honorific title designating the Messias, the legate or servant of God? Or did it have already in the mouth of the Lord, Apostles and others, at least sometimes, the strict meaning of natural and consubstantial filiation, as it undoubtedly has in the writings of St. Paul and St. John?

Some authors imply and even state that the primitive sense of the title had been merely honorific, just as in the Old Testament, and that thence by evolution it developed into the strict meaning. This opinion is expressly referred to and condemned in proposition

[7] Cf. P. Lagrange, "La Paternité de Dieu dans l'A.T.," *Revue Biblique*, XVII (1908), 481-99.

[8] *Bar 'Elāhā* (Heb., *ben hā-'Elohīm*). It is indeed true that the Jews of that time avoided the utterance of the name of "God,"—for this reason the High Priest said: "Son of the Blessed One," ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ (Mark 14:61); nevertheless, it must be noted that in the Greek New Testament the expression ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ often occurs. Cf. G. Dalman, *Die Worte Jesu*, pp. 219-37, particularly p. 223.

30 in the syllabus annexed to the decree *Lamentabili* (July 3, 1907): "In all the evangelical texts the name *Son of God* is equivalent only to *Messias,* and does not at all signify that Christ is the true and natural Son of God." [9]

Since in that proposition no distinction is made between the Synoptic Gospels and the Gospel of St. John, but it is said: *in all the evangelical texts* (therefore the *Johannine* texts are included), the opinion which would restrict a broad interpretation to the Synoptic Gospels would not be expressly condemned; although, in our judgment, such an opinion seems too daring and temerarious principally from the apologetical viewpoint. For the Synoptic Gospels, as all admit, bear a more primitive character than the Fourth Gospel, whose apostolic origin is denied by many outside of the Church. The witness of the Synoptic Gospels concerning the strict meaning of the title "Son of God" having been then rejected everywhere, some might immediately object: "Therefore the divine consubstantial filiation of Jesus is the fruit of a later faith." Hence there appears the theological importance of the question proposed regarding the testimonies of the Synoptic Gospels concerning the title "Son of God."

It is profitable to mention here that in all the writings of the New Testament this title is applied to *Christians:* the *sons of God,* the brothers of Christ and His coheirs; these namely constitute the *new Israel,* the *son of God* according to the spirit, the messianic promises having been fulfilled in their favor. "Le peuple chrétien," writes the learned Lesêtre," se compose des fils de Dieu rachetés par Jésus-Christ et devenus ses frères par la grâce.—1. Notre-

[9] Cf. *Enchiridion Biblicum,* p. 69, n. 214. A. Loisy himself in *Simples réflexions sur de Décret du Saint-Office "Lamentabili"* (1908), p. 71 f., referred that proposition to what he had previously written in *L'Évangile et l'Église,* p. 76: "L'on trouverait sans peine, dans les Évangiles, plus d'un passage d'où il résulte que le titre de Fils de Dieu était pour les Juifs, pour les disciples et pour le Sauveur même l'equivalent de Messie . . ." Then, citing the confession of Peter and the answer of Christ made at Capharnaum, he concludes, p. 77: "Quel qu'ait pu être le travail intérieur qui a produit cette conscience de la *filiation divine,* il est sûr que tous ceux qui ont entendu Jésus, amis ou ennemis, l'ont *identifiée à la conscience ou à la prétention messianique.* Il est assez téméraire aujourd'hui de soutenir que la signification essentielle du titre de Fils de Dieu était autre pour le Christ lui-même, et que son objet propre était la connaissance de Dieu comme pere (comme le prétend Harnack)."

Seigneur lui-même donne ce nom aux pacifiques, Matth. V,9; à ceux qui rendent le bien pour le mal, Matth. V,45; Luc. VI,35, et aux justes resuscités, Luc. XX,36.—2. Il parle souvent à ses disciples de Dieu comme de leur Père, Matth. V,48;VI,8;VII,11; Marc.XI,26; Luc.VI,36; Joa.XX,17, etc., et leur ordonne de l'invoquer sous ce nom, Matt.VI,9.—3. Ce titre de *fils de Dieu* n'est pas un simple nom pour le chrétien, il constitue une réalité, I Joa.III,1,2. Cette filiation est un don de Dieu, Joa.I,12; elle est produit par voie d'adoption, Rom.VIII,23; Gal. IV,5; Eph. I,5, et par le moyen de la foi, Gal. III,26: c'est une participation surnaturelle à la divine nature, selon II Petri I,4.[10] En consequence, Dieu traite comme des fils ceux qui lui appartiennent par la grâce, Hebr. XII,7, et les fait conduire par son Esprit, Rom. VIII,14,15.—4. Par ses vertus, le chrétien doit faire honneur à son titre de *fils de Dieu,* Philip.II,15. Toute la création attend la manifestation des *fils de Dieu,* afin d' avoir part à leur glorieuse liberté, Rom. VIII,19-21." [11]

THE TESTIMONY OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

The testimony of the Synoptic Gospels, in which that title is applied to Jesus Christ, is: in Matthew 10 times; in Mark 6 times; in Luke 7 times. However, some of these occur in parallel passages.[12] For the sake of clarity let us divide this evidence according to its origin.

(1) *The testimony of the demons proclaiming Jesus to be the Son of God.* Matt. 4:3,6=Luke 4:3,9: "If Thou art the Son of God . . ." Mark 3:12; cf. Luke 4:41: "Out of many persons also came demons, crying out and exclaiming, 'Thou art the Son of God!' And He rebuked them, and would not allow them to speak, because they knew Him to be the Christ." Matt. 8:29=Mark 5:7=Luke 8:28: The Gadarene (Gerasene) demoniac: "What is there to me and to Thee, Jesus, Son of God the most High?"

(2) *Beside the Cross the people hostile to Christ.* Matt. 27:40: "If Thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross." Matt.

[10] These last statements, with the citation of 2 Pet. 1:4, are added to the quoted text of Lesêtre.

[11] *Dict. Bibl. Vig.,* II, col. 2257.

[12] "Prospectus de Jesu Christo quatenus dicto Filio Dei in Evangeliis Synopticis," Cellini, *op. cit.,* pp. 12-20.

27:43: "He trusts in God; let Him rescue Him now if He desires Him, since He asserted, 'I am the Son of God.'"

(3) *The centurion beside the cross.* Matt. 27:54=Mark 15:39: "This was undoubtedly God's Son!"

(4) *The prologue of the Gospel according to St. Mark.* Mark 1:1: "Beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, Son of God." [13]

(5) *The angel speaking to Mary.* Luke 1:32: "He . . . shall be called Son of the Highest." Luke 1:35: "And, therefore, the Holy One who shall be born of thee shall be called Son of God."

(6) *The Apostles in the boat and Christ walking over the waters.* Matt. 14:33: "And those who were in the boat came and worshipped Him, saying, 'Truly, Thou art God's Son!'"

(7) *The profession of faith by St. Peter.* Matt. 16:16=Mark 8:29=Luke 9:20.

(8) *The voice of the heavenly Father.* At the baptism of Jesus, Matt. 3:17=Mark 1:11=Luke 3:22. On Mount Thabor, Matt. 17:5=Mark 9:7=Luke 9:35.

(9) *Jesus Himself before the Sanhedrin.* Matt. 26:63 (64-65) and Luke 22:70.

But, as Sanday [14] wisely notes, the full historical meaning of this title cannot be attained, unless also the texts in which Jesus speaks of God as His Father are examined: Matt. 7:21; 10:32; 15:13; 16:17; 18:10.19.35: "*my* Father (who is in heaven)." While still a boy, after He had been found in the temple among the doctors of the Law, He already confidently calls God absolutely His Father: "I must be in *my* Father's house" (Luke 2:49).

The same relation of paternity and filiation between Jesus and the heavenly Father is remarkably illustrated by the parable of the Wicked Vine-dressers, in which the only Son is sent by the Father after several servants (i.e., the prophets of old who had been sent); the Son inasmuch as heir having the same rights as the Father was elevated above them (Matt. 21:33-46 and par.).[15]

[13] "Filii Dei" is omitted in the works of Tischendorf, Hort and Soden; it is retained by Vogels, Merk, and Bover; and it is vigorously affirmed by Lagrange, who declares that all should keep it: *υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ* injustement omis . . . doit être retenu avec la grande majorité des mss" (*Saint Marc* [4th ed., 1929], p. 3).

[14] In the article cited above in Hasting's *Dict. of the Bible,* IV, p. 571 b and p. 572 b, "The correlative terms 'Father' and 'Son.'"

[15] Cf. our commentary in *Parabolae* (2nd ed., Rome, 1933), I, 365 f.

Moreover, the texts of greatest importance in this regard are:

(1) Matt. 11:27: "All things have been delivered to Me by My Father; and no one knows the Son except the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son, and he to whom it is the pleasure of the Son to reveal Him." Whether these words mean the universal governing power delivered to the Son by the Father or the universal communication of knowledge, as the context suggests, the dogmatic sense of this verse is the same: "*car si la connaissance du Fils n'est accessible qu'au Père, comme celle du Père au Fils, on doit conclure à une même transcendance de nature,*" as P. Lagrange well expresses it.[16]

(2) Mark 13:32: "But of that day or that hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven—not even the Son—none but the Father." The fate of this verse is unique. From it the Arians concluded that the Son was ignorant of the secrets of the Father, therefore He is not equal to the Father, He is not God. On the other hand, the Son is regarded as greater than all intellectual creatures, even greater than the angels, pure created spirits, above whom no one is conceived except the pure uncreated Spirit, God. Therefore, the divinity of the Son as consubstantial with the Father is manifestly implied. Truly, the Son knows all things which the Father knows; but as the incarnate legate of God He has not the mission of revealing that: in this sense He is said not to know.[17]

(3) Finally, the last words of Jesus, with the precept of making disciples of all nations and of baptizing them with the trinitarian formula, are of greatest importance in this matter. Matt. 28:18-20: "All authority is given to me in heaven and on earth. Go, therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all whatever I have commanded you: and lo, I am with you throughout all time, even until the consummation of the world!"

Therefore, the authority of the Son is the same as that of the Father: it is universal and eternal. The divine power of the Son sanctifying souls is the same as that of the Father and Holy Spirit.[18]

[16] *Saint Matthieu* (3rd ed., 1927), p. 228.

[17] Cf. Lagrange *Saint Marc* (4th ed., 1929), p. 350; J. Lebreton, *Histoire du Dogme de la Trinité* I (8th ed., 1927), 559-90, Note C.

[18] For the authenticity of the Trinitarian formula in Matthew, cf. Lebreton *op. cit.*, pp. 599-610, Note E. See also Cellini, *op. cit.*, pp. 278-309.

THE MEANING OF THE SYNOPTIC TESTIMONY

(1) The testimony of the *demons* proclaiming Jesus as the Son of God is outside of the natural order and above the knowledge of the contemporaries of Christ. The demons forced by a special revelation could have indeed acknowledged the divine nature of Jesus; but such a revelation not only is not proved, but *a priori* seems improbable from the fact that messianic salvation does not concern them and in order to obtain this, faith in Jesus the Son of God is necessary. The usage of the titles "Son of God" and "Son of God the most High" found in Jewish tradition is not technically or formally messianic.[19]

In what sense, therefore, do the demons proclaim Jesus the Son of God? It must be observed that Satan in the temptation speaks doubtfully: "If Thou art the Son of God . . ." From this it is presupposed that he had heard the voice of the Father at the time of Jesus' baptism. But seeing Jesus eating after the forty days' fast, he did not believe Him to be the true Son of God. If, on the contrary he had believed this, he would never have exposed himself to His avenging omnipotence. He, therefore, surmises that Jesus is especially protected by God; he suspects that He is the Messias and so tempts Him. In the words of P. Lagrange:

> Les termes de la tentation se rapportent à ceux du baptême. Satan a donc entendu la voix d'en haut. Cependant il emploie une formule dubitative: *Si tu es* . . . S'il savait avec certitude que Jésus est le Fils naturel de Dieu, il n'essaierait pas de le tenter. Mais il sait du moins que Dieu l'a investi d'un pouvoir surnaturel, qu'il est peut-être le Messie, et que lui aurait tout à craindre si Jésus se servait de ce pouvoir selon les intentions du Seigneur." [20]

That conclusion of the demons proclaiming Jesus to be "the son of God" because of His supposed messianic character appears clearly from the following text of Luke. For, when Jesus rebuked the

[19] "Le témoignage des esprits mauvais ou impurs est contraint et forcé. Jésus est d'abord le saint de Dieu (I,24), puis le Fils de Dieu (III,11), ou le Fils du Très-haut (V,7). *Ces noms ne sont nullement, selon l'usage courant, des synonymes de Messie*" (Lagrange, *Saint Marc*, p. cxlvii).

[20] *Saint Matthieu*, p. 59. Cf. also *Sum. theol.*, III, q. 41, a, 1, ad 1.

demons because of his proclamation and would not allow them to speak, Luke observes: "because they knew Him to be the Christ" (Luke 4:41).[21]

(2) The *people hostile* to Christ, as those passing near the place of Calvary, the chief priests, the scribes and other Jews standing near the cross, ironically repeat the words of the accusation and the words of the confession of Jesus. Hence their words have no independent sense or value; nor, as it is evident, do those words subjectively designate the natural divine filiation of Jesus, since they did not believe.

(3-4) *The confession of the centurion* according to Mark 15:39 must be considered together with the *title* of the same Gospel. The title truly indicates the object and at the same time the scope of this Gospel: namely, Mark intends to demonstrate the divinity of Christ, the supreme confirmation and confession of which is heard from the mouth of the centurion near the cross. So P. Lagrange excellently writes in his commentary to St. Mark on 1:1:

> Ces mots [*Fils de Dieu*] après *Jesus-Christ* ne peuvent désigner que la filiation divine dans un sens unique et propre. Il est tout à fait impossible de les entendre ici comme une *seconde affirmation* de la Messianité de Jésus, sur laquelle Marc n'a pas coutume d'insister. Il est d'ailleurs très naturel que Marc les ait ajoutés, d'autant plus que son évangile a pour but de mettre en relief le pouvoir surnaturel de Jésus, comme fils de Dieu." [22]

In regard to the confession of the centurion, it must first be noted that he certainly did not confess Jesus as the *Messias,* which concept was foreign to him as a pagan. But neither must it be said that He acknowledged Jesus as the eternal Son of God who became incarnate; but according to his pagan religious mind he recognized in Jesus the patient innocent victim, a certain power that was supra-human and in general divine. Mark, indeed, a disciple of Paul,

[21] In this connection Lagrange writes: "On voit ici que le monde démoniaque était bien informé, du moins, que Jésus était le Messie; dans la suite de Luc c'est peut-être a la suite de la tentation. Satan, repoussé, a du moins compris qu'il avait vraiment à faire au Messie, et qu'il serait redoutable à ses suppôts." *Saint Luc,* p. 153. In a similar manner Sanday writes (*loc. cit.,* p. 574 a): "But, looked at psychologically, the confessions of the demoniacs would not mean more than that they believed themselves to be in the presence of the expected Messiah."

[22] *Saint Marc,* p. 3.

putting that supreme confession in writing, interpreted that confession without doubt in the meaning of the true Son of God according to the proper purpose of his Gospel.[23]

(5) The *angel* announces to the *Virgin Mary* the supernatural conception of her son, the Messias, who therefore will be called the Holy One and the Son of God, not only insofar as He is conceived in time by the overshadowing Holy Spirit, but also insofar as He is begotten from eternity from the Father.[24]

Many exegetes are of the opinion that the message of the angel does not exceed the revealed messianic character and mission of Jesus who was to be born. For the incarnation of the eternal Word, the Son of God, is such a mystery, that it could hardly be understood by the first Jewish hearers or readers. But if indeed that progressive knowledge or faith can and ought to be conceded, yet on that account initial revelation must not be denied. Now indeed this explicit revelation is clearly implied in the double message of the angel.

At least the first message of the angel (Luke 1:31-33) does not transcend the messianic work of the son who was to be born of Mary, and who was called "Son of the Highest"; for immediately there is added: "the Lord God will give Him the throne of David His father; and He shall reign over the house of Jacob throughout the ages and His kingdom shall have no end" (1:32-33). This is a typically messianic message.

But having been asked by the Virgin how this shall be, the angel in his response ascends higher, and revealing the special operation of God in the conception of her son, he manifests His true nature by declaring: "And, therefore, the Holy One who shall be born of thee shall be called [or is] the Son of God" (1:35).

This progressive revelation on the part of the angel and the rising rhythm or climax of the Gospel narrative clearly imply the strict meaning of the title "Son of God" in the above passage.[25]

[23] Cf. *ibid.*, pp. cxlvii f.

[24] See our study *De Conceptione virginali Jesu Christe* (Rome, 1933), p. 15.

[25] Cf. Lagrange "La conception surnaturelle du Christ d'après Saint Luc," *Revue Biblique* (1914), pp. 188-208. The following words are well worthy of notice: "Cela dit, pas plus que M. Cellini, je ne voudrais nier la probabilité de l'explication messianique, *sans préjudice des lumières surnaturelles dont Marie fut gratifiée et qui la firent pénétrer plus avant dans le Mystère*" p. 194. "Un rhythme ascendant est mieux dans l'esprit des deux premiers

As St. Thomas teaches the angels from the beginning of their blessedness were taught about the mystery of the Incarnation in general, but in particular when they were sent to reveal mysteries,[26] so *a priori* it seems that we must affirm that to Mary, the mother of Jesus, the Son of God, was revealed in particular the true nature of her son conceived by the Holy Spirit.[27]

(6-7) Among the *statements of the Apostles* there is to be noted above all Peter's profession of faith. Since it is reported by the Synoptists in various ways, different explanations are given by authors.

Matt. 16:16	Mark 8:29	Luke 9:20
"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God."	"Thou art the Christ."	"Peter, replying, said, 'The Christ of God!'"

As Mark and Luke only refer to the confession of the messiahship, some exegetes (as for instance, Rose[28]) hold that in Matthew's Gospel the names "Christ" and "Son of God" are merely synonymous.

This is truly admitted by many authors for the preceding confession of the Apostles in Matt. 14:33;[29] but the special praise, which is bestowed upon Peter by Christ and to whom the primacy in the Church is promised (Matt. 16:17-19), invincibly proves that Peter, as the prince of the Apostles and the rock of the Church,

---

chapitres [de Luc]. Il y a donc, tout de même, une allusion à la *nature divine de l'enfant*" p. 196.

[26] I q. 57, a. 5, ad 1.

[27] Cf. Cellini, *op. cit.*, pp. 122 f.

[28] *Études sur les Évangiles* (1902; 4th ed., 1904), pp. 195 f. However, the author later retracted this opinion in *Revue Biblique* (1903), 353 f., as well as in his commentary *Évangile selon S. Matthieu, Bibl. de l'Enseignement scripturaire,* (Paris, 10th ed., 1911), pp. 127 ff.

[29] In this connection Cajetan, not to speak of earlier writers, wisely writes: "Profitentur [Apostoli] quod non secundum opinionem, sed secundum veritatem est Messias. *Circumloquuntur enim Messiam nuncupatione filii Dei*: sicut et Nathanael in principio quo venit ad Jesum, dixit: Tu es filius Dei (Joan. 1,49), nesciens tunc Trinitatis mysterium, quod Jesus postea manifestavit." *In quattuor Evangelia,* 1557 ed., f. 86 recto initio. The same thought may be found in Jansenius of Ghent, *Comm. in Concordiam Evang.,* clvii (Venetian ed. 1579, p. 347a), and in the works of St. Thomas as already indicated.

acknowledges Christ as the true Son of God: this confession Jesus will soon afterwards confirm in the Transfiguration, which represents the climax of the Gospel revelation.[30] So also the Angelic Doctor in his commentary to Matt. 16:16. To Peter, namely, called blessed by Jesus, St. Thomas answers:

> Sed quid est? Numquid alii non confessi sunt Filium Dei? Immo legitur de Nathanaele, Joan, 1,49. Item illi qui in navi supra cap. xiv,33. Quare ergo hic beatificatur Petrus, et non alii? Quia alii filium adoptivum confessi sunt, hic autem filium naturalem; ideo hic prae ceteris beatificatur, quia primus *confessus est divinitatem.*[31]

(8) In regard to the *testimony of the heavenly Father* it must be noted that at the beginning of Christ's public life (i.e., at the time of His baptism) and at the end of the Galilean ministry (i.e., on Thabor) before the humiliation of His Passion, the solemn and public manifestation of Jesus as the Son of God by the heavenly Father was altogether fitting.

Following many non-Catholic exegetes, Rose again affirms that both in His baptism as well as in His Transfiguration Jesus by no means is manifested as the eternal Son of the Father or Word by the heavenly voice. Those formulas, "This is My Beloved Son;" and "Thou art my Beloved Son," do not exceed the concepts found in the Old Testament. "Le Fils de Dieu n'est pas l'unique de Dieu dans le sens johannique, mais le Fils de Dieu dans le sens davidique et prophétique."[32] Those assertions are categorically made without any kind of *a priori* evidence.

If, on the contrary, one reads attentively the first few chapters of Matthew and Luke, one sees everywhere and always that Jesus is far superior to His Precursor. But the latter could not reveal the true origin and nature of Jesus the Messias; he only announced that one stranger than himself would come. Of this one the Baptist

[30] Cf. our study *De Baptismo, Tentatione et Transfiguratione Jesu* (Rome, 1934), pp. 157 f.

[31] In a similar manner Lagrange writes: "Tandis que ceux qui étaient dans la barque (XIV, 33) avaient vu en Jésus seulement un être surnaturel, Pierre en ajoutant l'article et la qualification de fils de Dieu vivant (ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ζῶντος), professe aussi clairement qu'il pouvait le faire, l'origine divine de Jésus, possédant la nature de l'être infini qui a la vie et peut la transmettre" (*Saint Matthieu*, p. 322).

[32] *Op. cit.*, p. 193.

declares that he is unworthy to carry His sandals and announced His Baptism in Spirit. This ascending rhythm, that elevates Jesus above the Baptist, logically leads to the heavenly Father proclaiming the divine eternal filiation of Jesus. This is well expressed by P. Lagrange:

> Toute l'histoire des origines de Jean et de Jésus, conduite jusqu'au moment ou ils se rencontrent pour la premiére fois, aboutit à constater la nature divine de Jésus. Il n'appartient pas à Jean de révéler ce mystère; il annonce seulement un plus fort que lui, dont il n'est pas digne de délier les sandales, et un baptême dans l'Esprit-Saint. Après que Jésus a été baptisé, l'Esprit-Saint apparaît, comme au moment de la conception surnaturelle il était venu sur Marie, et le Père reconnaît son Fils.[33]

In the historical development of the life of Jesus Christ the Transfiguration is the supreme revelation, the climax of the Gospel narrative: for all things which precede this event gradually lead to the high mountain, where Jesus is glorified; whatever indeed follows, leads down to the abyss of humiliation and death, whence the Lord rises as one exalted for eternity. The Transfiguration comes only after the confession of Peter, which the voice of the heavenly Father confirms. But after they came down from the mountain, Jesus predicted His imminent Passion, which was a scandal to His hearers and particularly to Peter: wherefore the Transfiguration is also a source of strength to the Apostles and a sign of Christ's glory.[34] It was, therefore, fitting that the Galilean ministry should terminate with the confession of Peter before He began the last journey to Jerusalem. It was fitting, I say, that the Father confer the supreme consecration upon Jesus as His Son, whom the disciples ought to obey, notwithstanding the scandal of the cross. By these divine manifestations, which were physically perceived, the faith of the Apostles shines forth, a faith strong as death.[35]

[33] *Saint Luc*, p. 115.

[34] Cf. our work mentioned above *De Baptismo* etc., p. 12; pp. 35-40 (de baptismo Jesu), pp. 126 f. and p. 151-60 (de transfiguratione).

[35] Cf. Lagrange, *Saint Marc*, p. 218 ff. It is a pleasure to quote here the deep thought of this venerated Master: "Si l'on considère d'une seule vue la suite de la religion, la nouvelle alliance s'appuyant sur l'ancienne révélation dont elle se détache pour grouper tous les peuples, la perpétuité du dessein de Dieu aboutissant a la supériorité avouée de Jesus sur les hommes les plus grands du passé, le culte qui lui est aujourd'hui rendu aussi bien qu'à son Père,

(9) Appearing *before the Sanhedrin,* Jesus at the request of its members: "If Thou art the Christ, tell us so" (Luke 22:66), replies: "If I were to tell you so . . . you would not believe Me (22:67). Henceforth, however, the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of the Power of God" (22:69). " 'Thou art, then, the Son of God?' they all asked. He answered them, 'You yourselves say that I am' " (22:70). " 'What further need have we of evidence?' they then said; 'for we ourselves have heard it from His own mouth' " (22:71). In the parallel passage Matthew writes that the high priest tore his garments saying, "He has blasphemed" (Matt. 26:65). And to his question what punishment must be inflicted, the other members of the Sanhedrin replied: "He deserves death" (Matt. 26:66).

Again and again critics declare that these men understood in the words of Jesus nothing more than the declaration of His messianic dignity. Those words, therefore, "Christ, the Son of God, and the Son of man sitting at the right hand of the Power of God" would be synonymous with the declaration of His messiahship. "Ces trois titres, Christ, Fils de Dieu, Fils de l'homme partageant la gloire de Dieu, sont synonymes," according to Rose.[36]

But P. Lagrange, who is very proficient in the doctrines of the Jews pertaining to messianism,[37] observes that this synonymous meaning is scarcely proven. The Jews could discuss endlessly the guilt of a poor man suffering from hallucinations proclaiming Himself to be the Messias (and at that period such instances were not infrequent). Jesus indeed had raised to supernatural heights messianism and truly vindicated His own messianic nature: the Messias sitting at the right hand of the divine majesty appeared as equal to God. Hence the blasphemy that they judged worthy of

---

on s'étonne que toute cette miraculeuse histoire ait été esquissée en quelques traits dans la Transfiguration. Le génie ne crée rien de tel car il ne dispose pas de l'avenir" (pp. 257 f.).

[36] *Op. cit.,* p. 196.

[37] It suffices to cite two of these monumental works, *Le Messianisme chez les Juifs, 150 av. J.-C. à 200 apr. J.-C.* (1909), and *Le Judaïsme avant J.-C.* (1931).

death, since in any other case Jesus would have been for the unbelieving members of the Sanhedrin only a weak man.[38]

The mission itself of Jesus the Messias, the Saviour of all, seems to demand that He would speak so openly at this critical moment, lest the spiritual rulers of the people and the entire populace of the Jews would ever have an excuse for their obstinate incredulity.

Therefore, the supreme declaration of Jesus understood in this way (Luke 22:70)—which was confirmed both by His accepted death and glorious resurrection—perfectly squares with the initial message of the angel: "He shall be called, He shall be the Son of God" (Luke 1:32.35).

Let us conclude. The Jews indeed were expecting the Messias, as the son of David, a mere man. Jesus of Nazareth came as the Messias, and such were His deeds and words that they, with His disciples, should have acknowledged Him to be Messias and Son of God.

Those who everywhere interpret this title "Son of God" in the broad sense, do not acknowledge another Messias than Jewish, but those who understand that title in the strict sense adore the Messias as God Incarnate and they raise the entire Gospel up to heaven, whence light and truth came to us.

JAMES M. VOSTÉ, O.P.

The Angelicum
Rome, Italy

[38] "On aurait pu discuter indéfiniment sur le Messianisme et sur la culpabilité d'un homme qui se disait le Messie. Mais Jésus avait élevé le Messianisme à des hauteurs surnaturelles; le Messie était donc l'égal de Dieu! La conséquence était difficile à éviter pour qui regardait le Messie comme l'être assis à la droite de Dieu. . . . Jésus s'est désigné comme Fils de l'homme, mais un pareil Fils de l'homme n'aurait-il pas la prétention d'être plutôt le Fils de Dieu? . . . Jésus alors confesse qu'il est bien le Fils de Dieu. . . . Il est clair que d'après les Juifs qui ne voyaient qu'un homme en Jésus, c'était un horrible blasphème, qui méritait la mort" (*Saint Luc*, pp. 573 f.).

THE FUNCTION OF THE PAPACY

Some months ago, the front cover of *Time,* the weekly news-magazine, carried a picture of a certain anti-Catholic Protestant clergyman. That this particular individual should appear on *Time's* front cover is not important, but the background of the picture, executed in true *Time*-style, was (presumably unintentionally) significant. Behind the portrait rose the globe of the world encompassed by green, blue and black storm-clouds. In a brilliant gloom-dispelling light loomed the golden symbol of hope, seven massive crosses lashed together by white ropes. The caption read, "Disunity is a denial." *Time,* had unconsciously, captured and crystallized the truth. For religious unity outside Peter's fold can only be a tenuous union lashed together by the threads of compromise, negative agreement, and the least common denominator, "anti-Romanism." To Catholics the significance of the cover is only too apparent.

"But Catholic unity is a tyranny, and does violence to the essential democratic character of the human intellect," objects the modern Protestant. "Why do Catholics obey the Holy Father?" he asks. Immediately the *de Ecclesia* deluge of Matt. 16:18, John 21:15, Luke 22:31 floods the mind; syllogisms evolve, setting forth historically and critically certain arguments for the juridical rights of Pius XII. These arguments, of course, are valid, and their role in theology must not be underestimated; but their present crystallized form has resulted from centuries of Dissident, Protestant, and Gallican controversy. They vindicate Peter's primacy and Catholicism's unity, but do they really portray the integral meaning of that living unity centered about Peter?

No explanation of the Papacy can prescind entirely from historical considerations, because the primacy of Peter is an historical fact. In the remarkable plea for unity voiced by Vladimir Solovyev, himself a Russian Orthodox, we read:

> All arguments in support of the supreme central authority of the Universal Church would in our view have but little weight if they were only arguments. But they rest upon a divine-human *fact* which remains essential to the Christian faith despite all the artificial interpretations by which men have attempted to suppress it. . . . Similarly, when we wish to prove that an indivisible centre is essential to this

same hierarchy, it is the fact of the special choice of Peter to serve as a human *point d'appui* for the divine truth in its constant struggle against the gates of hell—it is the fact of this unique choice which provides a firm foundation for all our arguments.[1]

Nevertheless, too great emphasis on this divine-human *fact* has often led exclusively to historico-apologetic arguments to confound our adversaries, whereas the richer dogmatic appreciation and consideration of the Papacy have been passed over. We cannot hope to understand fully the reasons for the Papacy, because they are hidden away in the mystery which is the Church. But the Vatican Council teaches us that "Reason, indeed, enlightened by faith, when it seeks earnestly, piously and calmly, attains by a gift from God some, and that a very fruitful, understanding of mysteries; partly from the analogy of those things which it naturally knows, partly from the relations which the mysteries bear to one another and to the last end of man." [2] Some of the dogmatic implications, therefore, of the Papacy can be gathered from a consideration of the mystery of the Church of which it is the dynamic part. Certain documents of the Fathers and of the *magisterium* will enlighten our consideration, and the argument *ex ratione theologica* can further enhance these truths. Though some of these reasons may only yield, it is true, an *argumentum ex convenientia,* they are not therefore to be despised.[3] The great scholastic theologians used such an argument quite frequently, and it is often such a consideration that clothes the dry bones of the apologetic arguments and builds them up into the living, appealing, organic whole which corresponds to the reality of Catholic life.

It is this approach which is being adopted here, and our answer, briefly, to the question, "Why do Catholics obey the Holy Father?"

[1] *Russia and the Universal Church,* (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1948), p. 92. Cf. Leo XIII, *Satis cognitum,* (*ASS,* XXVIII (1896), 711): "Verum in diiudicanda statuendaque natura unitatis, multos varius error de via deflectit. Ecclesiae quidem non solum ortus, sed tota constitutio ad rerum voluntate libera effectarum pertinet genus: quocirca ad id quod revera gestum est, iudicatio est omnis revocanda, exquirendumque non sane quo pacto una esse Ecclesia queat, sed quo unam esse is voluit, qui condidit."

[2] Sess. III, c. 4 (*Coll. Lac.* VII, 253; Eng. translation from Dom C. Butler, *Vatican Council* [London: Longmans, Green, 1936], II, 265).

[3] Cf. P. Charles, S. J., "Vicarius Christi," *Nouv. Rev. Theol.,* LVI (1929), 455.

is, because he is the Vicar of Christ and as such is the source of our unity. For Christ instituted His Church as the instrumental cause to continue the work of the Redemption, and set Peter at the head of the Church to insure the unique character of that instrument.

To investigate the function of the Papacy, we must look to the mediatory character of the Church itself. The Triune God's determination to restore the rebellious creature, man, was a determination to use created nature as an instrumental cause in that restoration. Obviously, God did not have to restore man by these means; a single act of the divine Will would have sufficed, but divine Wisdom resolved to guarantee life eternal for man in a fashion more conformable to his condition as a creature. The redemption in all its manifestations is an act of divine charity reaching man through the play of a multitude of instrumental causes. The Incarnation, which redemption presupposes in order that satisfaction for sin might be condign, is the mystery of the union of God with an instrumental cause.[4] This truth, that God does employ instrumental causes, to us perhaps quite evident, has been for centuries the stumbling-block for many non-Catholics. "Shocking" is the epithet applied to the idea of a creature collaborating with his uncreated Creator. Yet to deny the quality of instrumental causality in redemption and salvation is simply theological occasionalism.[5] Moreover, it is eventually a denial or a diminution of the essential attributes of God, His Goodness and His Wisdom. "Detrahere perfectioni creaturarum est detrahere perfectioni virtutis divinae," says St. Thomas.[6]

The chief instrumental cause in the Redemption of man was the created human nature assumed by the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity. According to St. John, ". . . misit Deus Filium suum in mundum. . . . ut mundus salvetur *per ipsum.*"[7] The Word Incarnate died and redeemed man. But to perpetuate that redemptive act so that all men might partake of its fruits, Christ said, "I will

[4] Cf. S. Tyszkiewicz, S. J., *La Sainteté de l'Église Christoconforme,* (Rome: Pont. Inst. Orient. Stud., 1945), pp. 120-29.

[5] Cf. J.-H. Nicolas, O. P., "La Médiation de l'Église," *Rev. Thom.,* XLVI (1946), 413 ff.

[6] *Contra gent.* III, 69.

[7] *John* 3:17.

build my Church."[8] In the words of the Vatican Council, "The Eternal Pastor and Bishop of our souls, in order to continue for all time the life-giving work of His Redemption, determined to build up the Holy Church."[9] And the Church thus became an instrument in the hands of the God-Man.

But what would be the nature of that instrument? Since the choice of an instrument was not simply to be the gathering of a group of individuals joined by some mysterious, internal mode of union, nor simply a channel through which redemption would reach men as individuals, the determination of the nature of the Church as a visible, external society was more in accord with its mediatory character and with the nature of man himself. Grace, the fruit of the redemption, is a *bonum commune* for mankind redeemed. Though Christ could have chosen a way to dispense this grace to individuals as individuals, He selected a means more conformable to the nature of the instrument that was to co-operate in its own redemption. In other respects man is a social being; so too it was fitting that his subjective redemption should be worked out through social means. For grace, as a *bonum,* partakes in a limited way of the diffusive character of all goodness, and the normal form which the fecundity of goodness takes among men is society.[10]

But the *ratio formalis* of a society in the juridical order is the union of intellects and wills in the choice and use of means to attain a given end. The unifying principle, however, cannot be found in the individual wills, which are free in the choice of means to a given end. Consequently, the principle of unity must be sought outside the individuals. Though the *finis* of a society acts as a unifying principle, in the practical realm it is not necessarily efficacious; and so a further principle is required, authority. Due, therefore, to the mediatory role that the Church was to play in the plan of redemption, we find the instrument chosen by Christ to be a visible, external society, whose authority is radically vested in one visible Head, commissioned to propose to men that nature of their redemption, and to provide the essential guide in the choice of means necessary to attain that supernatural end. In the words of Leo XIII,

[8] *Matt.* 16:18. Cf. V. Solovyev, *op. cit.,* p. 85.

[9] Sess. IV, Prooemium (*Coll. Lac.,* VII, 482).

[10] Cf. J.-H. Nicolas, *art. cit.,* p. 417.

Wherefore Jesus Christ bade all men, present and future, follow Him as their leader and Saviour; and this, not merely as individuals, but as forming a society, organized and united in mind. In this way a duly-constituted society should exist, formed out of the divided multitude of peoples, one in faith, one in aim, one in the participation of the means adapted to the attainment of the aim, and one as subject to one and the same authority.[11]

To supply this guidance for all men of the centuries to come, to be the visible head of this divinely founded society, is the function of Peter and his successors, for "in the counsels of His loving Providence Christ has preferred to help men by the instrumentality of men." [12]

In an allocution to the Pastors of Rome Pius XII described the function of a Pope.

[The Church is] visible in its life, in its history, in its conflicts and in its triumphs, in its worship, in its sacraments, in its ministers, in its Hierarchy; visible in this Rome, where the Vicar of Christ is the center of its unity and the font of authority, as one to whom all the other Pastors must be united, and from whom these receive immediately their jurisdiction and their mission. It is his concern to confirm the Church in faith, as the first and universal Pastor, and Pastor of pastors; it is his concern to prevent and correct abuses, to keep inviolate the deposit of the doctrine of Christ, and the sanctity of morals, and to condemn error authentically. He alone, the successor of Peter, the foundation-stone of the Church, can, like Peter among the Apostles at the first Council of Jerusalem. . . . *cuius dignitas etiam in indigno herede non deficit,* arise and, conscious of the dignity received from Christ, speak and say, *"Viri fratres, vos scitis quoniam ab antiquis diebus Deus in nobis elegit per os meum audire gentes verbum evangelii et credere."*[13]

From the lips of Pius XII authoritatively teaching is to come the visible unity of Christ's Church, for he is "the center of its unity and the font of its authority." So closely were Peter and unity identified in St. Augustine's mind that he could write: "has enim claves non homo unus accepit, sed unitas accepit Ecclesiae." [14]

[11] "Satis Cognitum," *ASS,* XXVIII (1896), 724 (Eng. Translation from *AER,* XV (1896), 132 f.).

[12] *Ibid.,* 708 (*AER,* XV, 114).

[13] "Allocutio ad Parochos Urbis," *AAS,* XXIV (1942), 141.

[14] *Sermo* 295. 2, 2; *MPL,* XXXVIII, 1349.

Like an echo ringing through the centuries, the voice of Pius XII reaches us and teaches us that he is the source of unity. From the time of Ignatius of Antioch, through Clement of Rome, Irenaeus, Cyprian and Optatus, the same truth has been repeated. Cyprian spoke of "Petri cathedram . . . unde unitas sacerdotalis exorta est." [15] And again, "ut unitatem manifestaret [Christus], unitatis eiusdem originem ab uno incipientem sua auctoritate disposuit." [16] Optatus of Milevis wrote against a Donatist, "You cannot deny that you know that in the city of Rome the Episcopal chair was first conferred on Peter. In this chair Peter, head of all the Apostles (whence his name Cephas), has sat; in which chair alone unity was to be preserved for all. . ." [17] Jerome, too, wrote: "inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut, capite constituto, schismatis tollatur occasio." [18] And Pacianus: "Ipso referente Matthaeo (16, 19) paulo superius ad Petrum locutus est Dominus; ad unum, ideo ut unitatem fundaret ex uno." [19] When, therefore, Pius XII looks upon himself as the source of unity, he is simply following the tradition of centuries.

This principle of social unity set up by Christ in His Church is often described in three ways as *unitas regiminis, unitas fidei* and *unitas communionis*. Yet in the teaching of the *magisterium* we often find it described in a slightly different manner as an *unitas fidei et caritatis*. Perhaps we might say that this manner is a more faithful picture of reality. For the Pope in the reality of Christian life is also the visible center to which all Catholics are linked by the bond of charity. The Vatican Council, repeating a thought common to many preceding ages, declared, "The Eternal Pastor . . . determined to build up the Holy Church, wherein, as in the House of the living God, all who believe might be united in the bond of

[15] *Epist.* 59, c. 14; *CSEL*, III, part 2, 683.

[16] *De Unit. Eccl.*, c. 4; *CSEL* III, part 1, 212 f.

[17] *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam* 2, 2; *CSEL* XXVI, 36.

[18] *Adv. Iovinianum* 1, 26; *MPL*, XXIII, 247. This same thought was repeated and elaborated by Pope Gelasius I: "Ut capite constituto schismatis tolleretur occasio, et una monstraretur compago corporis Christi, quae ad unum caput gloriosissima illa dilectionis societate concurreret; et una esset Ecclesia, cui fideliter crederetur, unaque domus, unius Domini et unius Redemptoris, in qua de uno pane et de uno calice nutriremur." (*Epist.* 14; *MPL*, LIX, 89).

[19] *Epist.* 3, c. 11; *MPL*, XIII, 1071.

one faith and one charity." [20] It is this *vinculum caritatis* that saves the unity of Catholicism from being a tyranny, and that transforms it into a real *communio;* it is, in part at least, the unity for which Christ prayed, "ut omnes unum sint sicut tu, Pater, in me, et ego in te . . . ut dilectio qua dilexisti me, in ipsis sit, et ego in ipsis." [21]

In 1864 Pius IX wrote through an encyclical of the Holy Office to the Bishops of England,

> Ecclesia igitur catholica una est unitate conspicua perfectaque orbis terrae et omnium gentium, ea profecto unitate cuius principium radix et origo indefectibilis est beati Petri Apostolorum Principis, eiusque in Cathedra Romana successorum suprema auctoritas et potior principalitas. Nec alia est Ecclesia catholica nisi quae super unum Petrum aedificata in unum conexum corpus atque compactum unitate fidei et caritatis assurgit. . .[22]

And it is St. Ambrose who explains for us the reason behind the choice of Peter to be the source of unity.

> The Lord does not hesitate. He interrogates, not to learn but to teach. When He was about to ascend into Heaven He left us, as it were, a vice-regent of His love . . . and so because Peter alone of all others professes his love he is preferred to all—that being the most perfect he should govern the more perfect.[23]

Some of the Fathers, in extending the sense of *Matt.* 16:18, point out that Peter's *faith* in Christ, openly proclaimed at Cesarea Philippi, is the rock on which the God-Man promised to build His Church.[24] Yet beside the lake of Genesareth it was after the triple protestation of his *love* that Christ conferred on Peter the primacy. And so the rock-foundation of Christ's Church has often been interpreted in terms of charity. Benedict XV, echoing St. Cyril of Alexandria, wrote,

[20] Sess. III, c. 4 (*Coll. Lac.*, VII, 253; Butler, *op. cit.*, II, 265).

[21] *John* 17:21, 26.

[22] *ASS*, XXVII (1894), 66.

[23] *Expos. Evang. sec. Luc.*, lib. 10, n. 175-176; *MPL*, XV, 1848.

[24] Cf. Hilary, *De Trin.*, lib. 6, n. 36-37; *MPL*, X, 187; Ambrose, *De Incarn.*, c. 5, n. 34; *MPL*, XVI, 862; Leo the Great, *Sermo* 4, 3; *MPL*, LIV, 150.

. . . qua in mystica petra, idest totius ecclesiastici aedificii fundamento, quasi quodam in cardine et centro, non minus catholicae fidei quam christianae caritatis communio consisteret. Id quidem esse Primatus Petro conlati singulare munus ut caritatis, item ac fidei, divitias usquequaque diffunderet, atque in omnibus veluti tueretur, Ignatius Theophorus, . . . pulchre declaravit, cum eam [i. e., Ecclesiam Romae] "universo coetui caritatis Praesidentem" nuncupavit, scilicet ut significaret non modo Ecclesiam universam esse adspectabilem divinae caritatis imaginem, sed etiam Romanae Sedi beatissimum Petrum, una cum Primatu, caritatis suae erga Christum triplici confessione affirmatae reliquisse hereditatem ut eodem igne fidelium omnium animos incenderet.[25]

To be the *cardo et centrum caritatis* as well as the *principium et fundamentum unitatis* is the function of the Papacy, an heirloom handed down from Peter to Pius to stir up the hearts of all Christians. In this connection it is interesting to recall how Vladimir Solovyev plays on the words *Roma* and *Amor,* for *Roma,* spelled backwards, is *Amor.*[26] And Peter's *Amor* is the mystical rock whose firmness is the basis of our unity.

St. Leo the Great, an important figure in the historical evolution of the primacy, writing in 446 to the Bishop of Thessalonica, who had been given the title of Vicar of the Apostolic See in Western Illyricum, sets forth the meaning of the Papacy. "Vices nostras ita tuae credidimus caritati, ut in partem sis vocatus sollicitudinis, non in plenitudinem potestatis." [27] In Leo's mind two traits mark the Papacy, plenitude of power and sollicitude.[28] Sollicitude is the mark of the bond of charity centered in the Pope, and is the reason why Pius XII today likes to call himself *il Padre della Cristianità.*[29]

But the significance of Peter as the center of unity and of charity in the Church is still better understood from a consideration of

[25] "Principi Apostolorum," *AAS,* XII (1920), 457 f.

[26] *Op. cit.,* p. 109.

[27] *Epist.* 14, c. 1; *MPL,* LIV 671.

[28] These two marks were likewise used to characterize the function of the Pope by St. Bernard; cf. *De consideratione,* lib. 2, c. 8; *MPL,* CLXXXII, 751.

[29] Cf. *AAS,* XXXIV (1942), 324; XXXV (1943), 171; XXXVI (1944), 166.

that cherished title, Vicar of Christ.[30] While it has always been traditional to call Christ the Head of the Mystical Body, which is His Church, following the example of Paul—"Et ipse est caput corporis ecclesiae" [31]—tradition also refers to the Pope as *Caput Ecclesiae*. In the *Decretum pro Graecis* of the Council of Florence we read,

> We likewise define that the . . . Roman Pontiff holds the primacy of the Church throughout the whole world: and that the same Roman Pontiff is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and the true Vicar of Christ, the head of the whole Church, and the father and teacher of all Christians.[32]

Since Christ Himself, the Incarnate Word, is the Mystical Head of the Church, and as such is present to that Mystical Body at all times, in this sense He fulfills the promise that He made to the Apostles, "Et ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem saeculi." [33] As the Founder of that visible society of men He was likewise its juridical Head, exercising authority over it. When He was about to depart from the visible presence of His Church, He set up Peter as the secondary juridical head of that society. In this sense the Roman Pontiff is *Vicarius Christi*.[34] For Christ's mission had a spiritual aspect and a juridical aspect; the spiritual mission Christ is still performing today, for from Him

[30] The use of the title *Vicarius Christi* goes back to the time of Pope St. Gelasius I, and was used as a "synodal acclamation for that pontiff," being used eleven times "in a synod at Rome on March 13, 495." (Cf. J. C. Fenton, "Vicarius Christi," *AER*, CX [1944], 459-470.)

[31] *Col.* 1:18. Cf. S. Tromp, S. J., *Corpus Christi quod est Ecclesia*, (Rome: Gregorian University, 1946), I, 86.

[32] *Mansi* XXXI, 1031E.

[33] *Matt.* 28:20.

[34] So Bishop Leahy, the *relator* at the Vatican Council, conceived it. "Certe Christus Dominus est principium primarium non solum unitatis, sed etiam omnium spiritualium donorum, quae opitulante Spiritu Sancto, operante Spiritu Sancto in sinum dilectae suae sponsae Ecclesiae effundit et semper est effusurus. Sed Christus praeterea posuit in ipsa Ecclesia, praeterea voluit in ipsa constitutione Ecclesiae, principium unitatis secundarium, vicarium. Quamvis enim Iesus Christus Dominus noster sit semper invisibiliter cum Ecclesia, eam per gratiam Spiritus Sancti docens, regens, vivificans; ea tamen omnia facit modo accommodato societati externae et visibili, qualis est Ecclesia . . . posuit in ipsa constitutione Ecclesiae illud, quod dicimus principium unitatis." (*Coll. Lac.*, VII, 306).

grace flows into the members of the Mystical Body. In no way is Pius XII the Vicar of Christ as the Mystical Head of the Church, but only as its juridical head. This does not give us a two-headed monster, to use the phrase of Boniface VIII,[35] but a perfect subordination of powers according to the Will of Christ. Pius XII in an allocution to the Cardinals on his name-day, beautifully described the Pope's relation to Christ:

> They, therefore, who . . . declare that there is no Vicar of Christ on earth, because Christ Himself has promised to remain with His Church as its Head and Lord until the end of time . . . ignore and disfigure the profound sense of the primacy of the Pope, which is not a negation, but a completion of that promise. If, then, it is true that Christ in the fulness of His divine power disposes of the many and various forms of illumination and of sanctification in which He is really with those whose avow it, it is no less certain that He wished to entrust to Peter and his successors the guidance and governance of the universal Church, and the treasures of truth and of grace contained in His redemptive work. The words of Christ to Peter leave no doubt as to their meaning. So the West and the East acknowledged and believed with admirable harmony *tempore non suspecto.* The desire to create an opposition between Christ as Head of the Church and His Vicar, the desire to see in the affirmation of one the negation of the other is to do violence to the clearest and most luminous pages of the Gospel, to close the eyes to the most ancient and venerable testimonies of tradition, and to deprive Christianity of a precious heritage.[36]

Through Peter and his successors Christ can again say, "Ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus," and the visible expression of that promise fulfilled is Pius XII gloriously reigning.

Christ spoke of "Ecclesia mea," and it is *His* even today as He is still its Head. Peter and Pius are the Vicars of Christ in time; from Him they directly receive their powers, and exercise them only in the name of Christ. Pius XII does not superimpose his power on Christ's, but he holds and exercises his authority by participation. "Qui vos audit, me audit et qui vos spernit, me spernit."[37]

[35] "Unam sanctam," *DB,* 468.

[36] "Allocutio ad Em. D. Cardinales," *AAS,* XXXVI (1944), 172. Cf. also Pius XII, "Mystici Corporis," *AAS,* XXXV (1943), 210 f.; V. Solovyev, *op. cit.,* p. 93, where the metaphors of Peter the Rock and Christ the Rock are similarly explained.

[37] *Luke* 10:16.

Consequently, as all the Roman Pontiffs have been Vicars of the God-Man, visible Catholic unity traces its source back through Pius and Peter visible to Christ invisible. They are all vicars of *one* Christ.

The titles that have been bestowed upon the Roman Pontiff almost from apostolic times are an eloquent testimony to the Church's conception of the papacy. Leo XIII recalled some of them in his Encyclical, *Satis cognitum:*

> Hence those remarkable expressions of the ancients concerning St. Peter, which most clearly set forth the fact that he was placed in the highest degree of dignity and authority. They frequently call him "the Prince of the College of the Disciples; the Prince of the holy Apostles; the leader of that choir; the mouthpiece of all the Apostles; the head of that family; the ruler of the whole world; the first of the Apostles; the safeguard of the Church." [38]

Yet no epithet expresses the function of the Pope so well as the one given to Simon by Christ Himself, "Thou art a Rock." The distinctive function that Peter was to have in the society Christ was founding merited for him a distinctive and permanent name. For Peter's role was to insure the unique character of the instrument the God-Man chose to perpetuate the work of the Redemption. For Peter, and Pius today, is the *principium unitatis* and the *centrum caritatis* of Catholicism.

JOSEPH A. FITZMYER, S.J.

Weston College
Weston, Mass.

[38] *ASS,* XXVIII (1896), 735; *AER,* XV, 146.

THE STUDY OF THEOLOGY IN THE PRIESTHOOD

Therefore, Venerable Brethren, it is necessary that the priest, even among the absorbing tasks of his charge, and ever with a view to it, should continue his theological studies with unremitting zeal. The knowledge acquired at the Seminary is indeed a sufficient foundation with which to begin; but it must be grasped more thoroughly, and perfected by an ever-increasing knowledge and understanding of the sacred sciences. Herein is the source of effective preaching and of influence over the souls of others.

—Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical *Ad catholici sacerdotii,* issued Dec. 20, 1935.

THE LOCAL CHURCH AND CHRIST'S POOR

One of the most important facts about the local Church or diocese within God's universal kingdom on earth is its special mission to the poor and the suffering. God calls all men into His Church, but that invitation is issued with special urgency to the indigent and the unfortunate of this world. The Church is adapted to the spiritual needs of the entire human race, but God has formed and fashioned it in such a way that the helpless and the afflicted are its primary concern. By the very force of the divine constitution of the Church, this characteristic of the universal society of the faithful in this world is meant to manifest itself most powerfully in the life of the individual local Church or diocese. The special concern of the diocesan bishop and of his *presbyterium* for the unfortunate of this world is something which results from the very nature of the *ecclesia* itself.

The helpless, the afflicted, the indigent, and the unfortunate of this world were, in a very special way, the objects of Our Lord's predilection. Actually the Incarnate Word's mission into the world was intended particularly and, as it were, primarily for these people. The Old Testament description of the Messias depicted Him as sent especially and pre-eminently to and for the poor and the helpless. Our Saviour's ministry among and in behalf of the poor was such an outstanding element of His activity during the course of His public life that He was able to point to it as a part of the evidence sufficient to convince St. John the Baptist that the Old Testament prophecies about the Messias were actually being accomplished in Him.

Our Lord ordered His disciples to take care of the poor and confirmed this command by the force of His own example. The apostles, mindful of His expressed teaching and of the commission He had given them, considered themselves in a special way bound to give assistance to those in want. As members of the apostolic *collegium,* the bishops of the Catholic Church are entrusted with this same privilege and charged with this same responsibility. The divine message they are commissioned to teach belongs to and is intended pre-eminently for the poor. The secular priests, who in each diocese constitute the *presbyterium* of the bishop, the sacerdotal fraternity devoted primarily and by reason of its very essence

to the work of the bishop, must labor zealously to bring the divine message with all of its consolations to the poor if they are to do their work faithfully.

It is definitely and literally true that the preaching of Our Lord was meant in a special way for the poor and the unfortunate. When Our Lord announced His Messianic character to His fellow-townsmen of Nazareth, He chose to read a passage from the prophecy of Isaias, telling of the special commission God had given the Messias to preach to those in need and suffering.

> And he came up to Nazareth, where he was brought up: and he went into the synagogue, according to his custom, on the sabbath day: and he rose up to read.
>
> And the book of Isaias the prophet was delivered unto him. And as he unfolded the book, he found the place where it was written:
>
> The spirit of the Lord is upon me. Wherefore he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor: he hath sent me to heal the contrite of heart,
>
> To preach deliverance to the captives and sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable day of the Lord and the day of reward.
>
> And when he had folded the book, he restored it to the minister and sat down. And the eyes of all in the synagogue were fixed on him.
>
> And he began to say to them: This day is fulfilled this scripture in your ears.[1]

Thus according to the prophecy of Isaias and according to Our Lord Himself, the immediate beneficiaries of His divine message are the needy, the poor (πτωχοί) and the afflicted of this world. His special love for the poor was not something merely incidental to His mission. It actually came about because of God's providential command. It was God's will that His blessings should be brought primarily to those in want and suffering. Basically, that is why work for the poor is the special duty of the Catholic Church, of the bishops who constitute its apostolic *collegium,* and of the diocesan priests who are commissioned by God to labor for the bishops in the various local Churches throughout the world.

Our Lord appealed to His own spiritual work for the poor, together with His miracles, as evidence strong enough to convince St. John the Baptist and his followers that He was truly the Messias promised in the Old Testament.

[1] *Luke* 4:16-21.

Now when John had heard in prison the works of Christ, sending two of his disciples, he said to him:

Art thou he that are to come, or look we for another?

And Jesus making answer said to them: Go and relate to John what you have heard and seen.

The blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, the poor have the gospel preached to them.

And blessed is he that shall not be scandalized in me.[2]

Since the business of Christ is that of the Church, and consequently that of the bishop and his diocesan priests, the fact that Our Lord devoted most of his attention during the course of His public life on earth to the spiritual and temporal relief of the helpless and afflicted gives us a clear indication of the type of service God has entrusted to the *presbyterium.* Almost every one of the gospel accounts of the crowds instructed by Our Lord informs us that people in need of physical as well as of spiritual ministration came to Him. The greater number of the very miracles by which He made evident the divine attestation of His claim to be the bearer of God's revelation were performed to relieve the physical distress and the suffering of His people. Our Lord Himself was in the habit of making financial contributions for the support of the poor, as we can see from the fact that when Judas Iscariot left the Last Supper for his errand of infamy, the rest of the apostles imagined that he had been instructed to purchase something for the feast or to give something to the poor.[3] Furthermore, the behaviour of Judas, and apparently of some other disciples, who grew angry at Mary of Bethany for using precious ointment to anoint the feet of Our Lord when "this ointment might have been sold for more than three hundred pence, and given to the poor," [4] shows us very clearly that it was Our Lord's usual practice to sell valuable presents and to give the sum realized for the relief of the poor. Furthermore, Our Lord Himself used this incident to point out the fact that the company of His disciples, the society which men know as the Catholic Church, was to find its usual employment in doing good to the poor.

[2] *Matt.* 11:2-6; see also *Luke* 7:18-23.

[3] Cf. *John* 13:30.

[4] *Mark* 14:5; see also *Matt.* 26:9; *John* 12:4.

"For the poor you have always with you," said Our Lord, "and whensoever you will you may do them good; but me you have not always." [5] Christ thus informed His disciples that their preoccupation with the poor was to last even after His own visible presence had been taken away from them.

The heroic devotion to the poor which consists in selling all of one's earthly possessions to relieve the distress of the unfortunate and afflicted was encouraged and counselled by Our Lord. When the rich young man came to Him asking what he might do to obtain eternal life, Our Lord made it clear that for this person, already a member of the kingdom of God on earth (since at that time the kingdom of God was still to be found in the religious commonwealth of Israel), observance of the commandments contained in the divinely revealed law was requisite. When the young man protested that he had kept these precepts from his youth, and when he showed himself anxious for greater perfection in the service of God, Our Lord advised him to sell what he had and to give the money he thus obtained to the poor, and then invited him to join the company of His disciples after making this great renunciation.[6] Our Lord intended that the renunciation of earthly wealth on the part of his disciples should be a means toward alleviating the distress of the poor. This invitation from Christ Himself explains the custom of the disciples in Jerusalem after the Ascension. The Acts of the Apostles tell us that these early followers of Christ had such a tender care for the poor of their own company that "neither was there any one needy among them. For as many as were owners of lands or houses sold them and brought the price of the things they sold, and laid it down before the feet of the apostles. And distribution was made to every one, according as he had need." [7] St. Peter's words to Ananias make it perfectly clear that this heroic charity for the poor was by no means obligatory for the members of the Church. He told the mendacious disciple that the land he had sold was rightfully his, as long as he had wished to retain it, and that the price he had received from the sale belonged to him, as long as he had wished to retain it.[8] Ananias was condemned and punished for perpetrating an outrage against God. This sin, however, was not the failure to give all of his property for the

[5] *Mark* 14:7; see also *Matt.* 26:11; *John* 12:8.
[6] Cf. *Matt.* 19:21; *Mark* 10:21; *Luke* 18:22.
[7] *Acts* 4:34-35.
[8] Cf. *Acts* 5:4.

relief of the poor, but the crime of lying to the apostles, the representatives of God presiding over the Church.

While Our Lord only advised or counselled the practice of giving up all of one's property for the relief of the poor, He was quite strict in His injunction to take care of the poor. He taught that his followers were bound to expend a certain amount of their wealth in providing for the unfortunate. They were obligated to give food and supplies to persons who would not have the power to pay them back.

> And he said to him also that had invited him: When thou makest a dinner or a supper, call not thy friends nor thy brethren nor thy kinsmen nor thy neighbors who are rich; lest perhaps they also invite thee again, and a recompense be made to thee.
>
> But when thou makest a feast, call the poor, the maimed, the lame, and the blind.
>
> And thou shalt be blessed, because they have not wherewith to make thee recompense; for recompense shall be made thee at the resurrection of the just.[9]

Our Lord praised unstintingly any outstanding generosity on the part of His followers in their care for the poor. Thus when Zacheus of Jericho made the promise: "Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor; and if I have wronged any man of any thing, I restore him fourfold"; Christ made the pronouncement that "This day is salvation come to this house, because he also is a son of Abraham." [10] Zacheus was called a son of Abraham, not merely by reason of carnal descent, but by reason of his profession of faith in the Saviour, through which profession he became perfectly integrated into the kingdom of God in this world, and was joined to Abraham's spiritual progeny.

Our Lord's mission to the poor of this world included an affectionate and realistic appreciation of the blessings God has given to them. He called attention to the contribution of the poor widow to the temple at Jerusalem, and observed that her contribution was actually greater than those of the rich. He spoke of the poor as "blessed" in His beatitudes. It is important to note that the first beatitude speaks primarily of the real poor. "Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God," [11] is the first beatitude according to the account of St. Luke. St. Matthew adds the words τῷ πνεύματι

[9] *Luke* 14:12-14. [10] *Luke* 19:8-9. [11] *Luke* 6:20.

in order to show that the kingdom of heaven, the Church of God in the New Testament, is to belong to those whose loyalty to Christ serves to detach them from the earthly riches that turn so many individuals away from their Creator.[12] Nevertheless, the unmistakable import of the proposition is that the Church of Christ is destined in a special way for the poor and the forgotten of this world.

The love and care for the poor which had dominated Our Lord's public life on earth were considered from the beginning as the special business and interest of the Church which He founded and within which He resides. The disciples did not forget that Christ, in one of the parables of the Kingdom, had taught about the recruiting of members for God's household in these terms: "Go out quickly into the streets and lanes of the city; and bring in hither the poor and the feeble and the blind and the lame." [13] The disciples themselves were men and women who could truthfully say to Christ, "Behold, we have left all things, and have followed thee." [14] As a result they were willing and even anxious to take care of the needy, particularly among their own brethren, even at the cost of all their earthly wealth.[15] The Church itself took care of the daily distribution of food and other supplies to the widows of the community.[16] The disciple Tabitha or Dorcas in Joppe, with her affectionate industry for the poor of the Christian Church in that city, carried on an activity essential to the kingdom of God in the New Testament.[17] The prayers and the alms of the centurion Cornelius gained him the grace of membership in the Church.[18]

St. Paul insisted upon the fact that concern for the poor throughout the universal Church of God was in a particular way the business of the apostolic *collegium*. Writing to the Galatians, he recalled that, at the time when the apostles in Jerusalem had given their approbation to his own apostolic ministry and that of Barnabas, they had explicitly mentioned the obligation to care for the poor.

[12] *Matt.* 5:3.
[13] *Luke* 14:21.
[14] *Matt.* 19:27; see also *Mark* 10:28; *Luke* 18:28.
[15] Cf. *Acts* 4:34-35.
[16] Cf. *Acts* 6:1-4.
[17] Cf. *Acts* 9:36-42.
[18] *Acts* 10:4.

And when they had known the grace that was given to me, James and Cephas and John, who seemed to be pillars, gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship: that we should go unto the Gentiles, and they unto the circumcision:

Only that we should be mindful of the poor: which same thing also I was careful to do.[19]

The work of caring for the poor was, of course, primarily a labor of divine charity. The Christians were obligated to relieve the want of their own brethren, by reason of the affection they were bound to have for one another in their capacity as brothers and sisters of Jesus Christ, as members of God's household which is the Catholic Church. As the president of this ἀγάπη, ruling and directing the society of divine charity as God's representative, the bishop of the local Church was bound to take the lead in aiding the indigent. Obviously, this obligation made it incumbent upon him, first of all, to take care of the needy in the local Church itself. The universal character of God's kingdom on earth, however, made it imperative that the members of each individual local Church and especially the heads of the various local Churches should be eager to aid their distressed brethren in other places. Thus we find that St. Paul asked the Churches of Rome,[20] Galatia,[21] and Corinth [22] for financial aid in relieving the poverty of the faithful in Jerusalem. The Churches of Macedonia, despite their own poverty and the persecutions they were suffering for the name of Christ, anticipated the desires of St. Paul.[23]

The Epistle of St. James insists that a local Church is recreant to its divine calling and dignity if the members display favoritism for the rich as against the poor. As a matter of fact St. James refuses to give the title of ἐκκλησία to the local Christian assembly in which the poor are neglected for the sake of the rich. Such a gathering of Christians is designated as a συναγωγή.[24] Perhaps more perfectly and plainly than any of the other New Testament writers, he brings out the dignity and the place of the poor in the company of Christ.

[19] *Gal.* 2:9-10.
[20] Cf. *Rom.* 15:25-27.
[21] Cf. *I Cor.* 16:1.
[22] Cf. *I Cor.* 16:1-4; *II Cor.* chapters 8 and 9.
[23] Cf. *II Cor.* 8:3-4.
[24] Cf. *James* 2:2.

Hearken, my dearest brethren: Hath not God chosen the poor in this world, rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom which God has promised to them that love him?

But you have dishonored the poor man.[25]

If, according to St. James, the kingdom of God belongs in a special way to the poor of this world, the *ecclesia Satanae* is, on the contrary, the peculiar preserve of the rich.

Do not the rich oppress you by might? And do not they draw you before the judgment seats?

Do they not blaspheme the good name that is invoked upon you?[26]

This concept of the Catholic Church as belonging to the poor is brought out also by St. Paul in his First Epistle to the Corinthians.

For the foolish things of the world hath God chosen, that he may confound the wise: and the weak things of the world hath God chosen, that he may confound the strong.

And the base things of the world and the things that are contemptible, hath God chosen: and things that are not, that he might bring to nought things that are:

That no flesh should glory in his sight.[27]

The Epistle of St. James brings out clearly the revealed truth that the love of charity for the poor within the Church of God demands a willingness to relieve their sufferings. The faith by which the disciple is joined to the church is something dead if it does not influence the person who possesses it to take care of his brothers who are in need. Mere protestations of sympathy for the unfortunate are certainly not enough.

And if a brother or sister be naked and want daily food:

And one of you say to them: Go in peace, be ye warmed and filled: yet give them not those things that are necessary for the body, what shall it profit?[28]

Writing to "the Church of God that is in pilgrimage at Corinth," St. Clement of Rome asserted that this Christian community, in the days of its former spiritual glory and perfection, had been outstanding in works of hospitality, and in being more ready to give than to receive. These works for the poor were considered, then,

[25] *James* 2:5-6.

[26] *James* 2:6-7.

[27] *I Cor.* 27-29.

[28] *James* 2:15-16.

as incumbent upon the local Church as a whole, and thus as pertinent, in a special way, to the functions of the bishop and his *presbyterium*.[29] The homily known as the *Secunda Clementis* lists the giving of alms to the poor along with prayer and fasting as characteristic Christian works, and insists that almsgiving is better than both prayer and fasting.[30] The *Didaché* also teaches about the giving of alms to the poor in such a way as to imply that this was an exercise, not merely for individual Christians, but for the local Church as a whole.[31]

The Roman Church, in which the divinely revealed teachings have always remained intact, was remarkable from the very beginning for its care for the Christian poor who belonged to other local Churches. In his *Ecclesiastical History,* Eusebius of Caesarea cites the following pertinent passage from a letter written by St. Dionysius, Bishop of Corinth, to Pope St. Soter, who reigned from 166 to 175.

> This has been your custom from the beginning, to do good in manifold way to all the brethren and to send contributions to many Churches in every city, relieving the poverty of the needy in some places, and ministering to the brethren in the mines. By these gifts which you have sent from the beginning you, true Romans, preserve the ancestral custom of the Romans. Your blessed Bishop Soter has not only continued this benefit, but has increased it, furnishing abundant supplies to the saints and, by his blessed words, exhorting the brethren who come to Rome as a loving father would his children.[32]

Eusebius himself asserts, in passing, that this custom of the Roman Church had continued up to the very time of the persecutions of his own day, the trials inflicted upon the Church by Diocletian and his associates.[33] Obviously the Roman bishops and their clergy had never failed to inculcate the essentially Christian lessons of brotherly love and of compassion for the poor within the household of the faith which is the Church of Jesus Christ.

[29] Cf. *Prima Clementis,* I, 2.

[30] Cf. *Secunda Clementis,* XVI, 4.

[31] Cf. *Didache,* I, 5.

[32] Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History,* IV, 23, 10.

[33] Cf. *op. cit.,* IV, 23, 9.

The martyr St. Cyprian manifestly regarded the care for the poor as the special task of the bishop, a task in which the clergy of his Church at Carthage were privileged and obliged to share.[34] St. Augustine speaks of the great number of the poor who are supported by the Church, and boasts that the Catholic Church is the Church of the poor. The legislation of the Church considered goods or money given to the Church as the property of the poor, in such a way that the persons who defrauded the Church of its inheritance were to be designated as despoilers of the poor.[35] The Christian attitude towards those in want and suffering was always based upon Our Lord's statement that His disciples would be judged by God on their conduct towards their poor brethren, in whom they were to see Christ Himself.

Then shall the just answer him, saying: Lord, when did we see thee hungry and fed thee: thirsty and gave thee drink?

And when did we see thee a stranger and took thee in? Or naked and covered thee?

Or when did we see thee sick or in prison and came to thee?

And the king answering shall say to them: Amen I say to you, as long as you did it to one of these my least brethren, you did it to me.[36]

It was in line with these words that the Church taught her children to treat their poor and suffering fellow-Christians as they would the Lord Himself. Just as St. Paul's persecution of the Church before his conversion was considered by Our Lord as a persecution of Himself,[37] so the conduct of the disciples towards their unfortunate and needy brethren was considered as their treatment of the divine Master. The charity which Christians are meant to have for God is utterly lacking in the person who refuses an effective and sincere love to the afflicted members of his own company, the Kingdom of God on earth. As St. John said, "He that hath the substance of this world and shall see his brother in need and shall shut up his bowels from him: how shall the charity of God abide in him?" [38]

Since the real love of charity in Christ for the poor is meant to

[34] Particularly in *Ep.* 7.

[35] Cf. Hefele-Leclercq, *Histoire des conciles* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1908), II, 456.

[36] *Matt.* 25:37-40.

[37] Cf. *Acts* 9:4-5.

[38] *I John* 3:17.

motivate the activity of the Church, it is the special business of the bishop and of his *presbyterium.* Because the truth of the Gospel is particularly and primarily intended for the poor, the diocesan priest who seeks to attain the objective God has set for the work of the *presbyterium* within the Catholic Church must strive by every means within his power to bring Our Lord's message to the poor. He is thus obligated to preach the revealed doctrine of the Church in all of its fullness and in perfect accuracy, clearly and intelligibly to the poor within the fold of Christ. He is bound to strive particularly for the conversion of the underprivileged who have not as yet been gifted with membership in the household of God.

Poor and needy and afflicted Catholics are at once the responsibility and the glory of the local Church to which they belong. Thus it is the business of the *presbyterium* of that Church to see to it that these brothers and sisters of Christ receive the truth Our Lord teaches within the society of His disciples. In order to carry out the commission they have received from Our Lord with reference to the doctrinal instruction of the poor, the diocesan priests must take a firm stand against that peculiar spiritual snobbishness which has infected a great deal of the writing of our own day. They must not allow themselves to imagine that a complete and adequate teaching of Catholic doctrine is something reserved, for all practical purposes at least, to a self styled "elite" among the Catholic laity. St. Peter and St. Paul, in their Epistles, greeted all the members of the Catholic Church without exception as the *electi.*[39] Apparently they had no thought of reserving this designation for wealthier Catholics, for those of the professional classes, or for those with a certain literary bent. Like them, the diocesan priest, who is privileged to share in his bishop's responsibility for the poor in Christ, must realize that, if there can be said to be a privileged and superior class within the Church of Jesus Christ, that class consists in the poor and helpless. Because, by virtue of his position in a diocesan *presbyterium,* the secular priest is in a special way obligated to work immediately for the objective or purpose of the local Church itself, he is bound to use all of the resources at his command to see to it that the little ones of Christ receive His message adequately, accurately, and clearly.

[39] Cf. *Col.* 3:12; *I Pet.* 1:1.

The diocesan priest has a *direct* responsibility for the instruction of the poor. Thus, in order to do the work for which God has commissioned him in the Catholic Church, the diocesan priest must repudiate that new and senseless variety of error which asserts that the modern priest is, for some reason or another, unfitted to deal immediately and directly with the ordinary layman. In our own time we have become almost accustomed to the theory that the modern layman cannot learn the theology of the Catholic Church from one of his priests, because the priests are supposed to have a special and highly unintelligible jargon of their own, utterly beyond the comprehension of a person who has not spent at least four years in a theological seminary. Any layman, however, regardless of his competence or lack of competence in the field of sacred theology, is apparently considered well able to give his brothers of the laity all of the theological truth they are supposed to wish or require. According to this theory, then, the instruction of the laity, and particularly of the poor, in the theological truths of the Catholic Church would be primarily and immediately the function of a certain privileged few among the laity themselves. These men would act as interpreters of the priests to their own people.

Needless to say, this position represents a definite perversion of the notion of Catholic Action. Most certainly the Catholic laity is privileged and is obligated to co-operate in the work of Christian instruction. The function of these laymen, however, is certainly not that of interpreting the teachings of the priests (or the teachings of scholastic theology) to the membership of the Catholic Church as a whole or to the poor of Christ in particular. They are meant to insist upon Catholic truth on occasions when and in places where the priest himself cannot be present. It is the privilege and the duty of the Catholic layman to bring out and to profess the truth of Jesus Christ throughout the course of his own life, at his work and in his recreation and home life. His efforts are meant to supplement and to complete the task of instruction which belongs essentially to the Catholic bishop, a work which the bishop, according to the divine constitution of the Church of Jesus Christ, carries out by himself and through the members of his own *presbyterium*. The notion of Catholic Action, and, for that matter, the notion of the Catholic Church itself, must be considered as radically perverted in the mind of the person who imagines that the diocesan

priest by reason of his very office is incapable of dealing directly and immediately with the people to whom his bishop has assigned him. The concept of Catholic Action is utterly ruined in the person who thinks that some layman must come between the priest and the poor of Jesus Christ.

The diocesan priest, then, in accordance with the divine commission of the *presbyterium,* is bound and privileged to give to all of his people, and especially to the poor and the neglected, the most complete and perfect instruction in the divinely revealed truth of the Catholic Church. In working towards the accomplishment of this task the diocesan priest will be only wasting his time by attempts "to make Catholic teaching more attractive." God Himself has given this Catholic message as His revelation to men. If it is accurately and adequately presented, it is in itself the most attractive teaching available to mankind. The priest who states God's public revelation correctly and in its completeness in the language of his hearers will find that the poor will find in that teaching a perfectly effective motivation for life in Christ, and a consolation that is truly the introduction to the joys of heaven.

Since, by virtue of his missionary function, the diocesan priest is obligated in a special way to work for the conversion of the non-Catholics in the particular territory to which his bishop has assigned him, he is obligated to work, as sincerely and energetically as possible, to bring the blessings of the Catholic faith and of the Catholic Church to the poor non-Catholics for whom he is responsible. It is interesting to note that one of the most important accomplishments of the Church in our own generation has been the magnificent work for the conversion of non-Catholic and even anti-Catholic poor laborers brought about by Canon Joseph Cardijn's famed Young Christian Workers. The type of person most benefited by this activity is the poor man for whom the truth of Jesus Christ is especially intended, according to the prophecy of Isaias and according to the teaching of Our Lord Himself. In order to bring this truth to his own non-Catholics in an effective manner, the diocesan priest will be forced to expend the sort of energy and intelligence and prayer which the devoted priests of Europe have employed for the propagation of the *J.O.C.* For the American diocesan priests, faced with difficulties and with a general situation quite different from those with which Canon Cardijn and his as-

sistants have coped so successfully, the work is and will be exacting. Yet the truth of Christ must be brought to the non-Catholic poor, and it is the particular responsibility of the diocesan priest to do this work. The fact that it is extraordinarily difficult constitutes a reminder that God has called his diocesan priests not to a life of ease, but to the tremendous dignity of laboring for Christ.

The members of the *presbyterium* do not satisfy their obligations to the poor, however, merely by working to instruct them in the truth of Jesus Christ. They must also make a sincere effort to relieve the needs and the sufferings of the unfortunate, particularly, of course, of the needy and afflicted members of the Church of God. It is their business to labor for the "edification" of a local Church rich in faith and in mutual charity. That objective will not be achieved unless the local Church manifests its charity for God and its love of the brotherhood by a willingness and anxiety to aid the poor, and primarily the poor of their own company. This care for the poor must be the work of the local Church as a unit, and of all the individual members of the local Church who are in a position to be of assistance to their needy brethren. The rich, in particular, must be made to see that they are responsible for the work of alleviating the sufferings of the poor, and that the fullness of their sharing in the work of Christ's Church depends in great measure on their fidelity to this obligation.

In order that the local Church within which he labors may thus attain the stature of supernatural perfection God demands of it, the diocesan priest must, of course, instruct all of his people on the necessity and the privilege of caring for God's poor. Most important of all, however, he must give an example of love for the poor and of practical and effective charity in their regard. All of the instruction he can give will be of little moment if he himself proves indifferent to the plight of the poor and if he manifests no personal interest in the problems and in the lives of the needy. If he shows a marked partiality for the company of the rich and the powerful, if he proves inaccessible to the poor or even fails to visit and console them personally, he is obstructing rather than aiding the progress of his own Church towards the perfection of charity and of fraternal love.

The concern Our Lord Himself showed for the poor, and the mission he has given to His Church and to the apostolic college for

the consolation and the aiding of the unfortunate, serve to show that the diocesan priest cannot acquit himself of his duties towards the little ones of Christ other than personally and directly. If no man can stand between the priest and his people with regard to the task of teaching the truth of Jesus Christ, no one can come between the priest and the poor in the work God has entrusted to His Church. It is perfectly true that the priest has at his disposal the various social work organizations, and the devoted laity of the St. Vincent de Paul societies. He should be willing and even anxious to avail himself of all of these agencies in laboring to relieve the distress of his brothers in Christ. Nevertheless, the presence of all of these effective and devout aids does not and cannot exempt the diocesan priest from a personal and direct interest in the needy. In order properly to do the work for which God has commissioned him, the member of the *presbyterium* must visit the poor and the sick and the afflicted himself. He must make his presence among these jewels of the Catholic Church a means for bringing these people nearer to Our Lord.

The immediate and whole-hearted concern of the diocesan priest with Christ's poor is especially requisite in our day and in our own country. The most militant and powerful of the anti-Christian movements of our time are precisely those addressed immediately to the poor. The cause of Our Lord will gain very little from efforts which, however well meant in themselves, neglected the men and women who have a particular right to and a particular place in God's kingdom. Courtier-priests and prelates, concentrating their influence on the rich and the powerful, have been in a great measure responsible for the spiritual ruin of the masses of the people in many European countries. Movements like those of Canon Cardijn are directed precisely towards winning back to the appreciation of the faith people who had been almost overlooked by some who were obligated to serve them.

The diocesan priest of today who makes it his business to concentrate on the spiritual and temporal relief of the poor, who sees to it that the poor have the message of Christ brought to them, must be the most important factor in the renewal of Christian life in the modern world. His concern for those in need is definitely not a mere matter of sentiment. It is based on God's own message, on the fact that the work of the Church, and thus the work of the

apostolic *collegium* and of the diocesan priesthood itself, is meant by God to be directed particularly and preeminently towards the poor of Jesus Christ.

Cardinal Newman wrote of the position of the poor in the Church while he was still a Protestant. Yet his position on this point was such that later he could publish these words as a Catholic priest.

> It will not be denied that, according to the Scripture view of the Church, though all are admitted into her pale, and the rich inclusively, yet the poor are her members with a peculiar suitableness, and by a special right. Scripture is ever casting slurs upon wealth, and making much of poverty. "To the poor the Gospel is preached." "God hath chosen the poor of this world, rich in faith and heirs of the kingdom." "If thou wilt be perfect, sell all that thou hast, and give to the poor." To this must be added the undeniable fact that the Church, when purest and when most powerful, *has* depended for its influence on its consideration with the many.[40]

Thus the perfect local Church of God, the reality described and praised in the letters of St. Paul, is and must be a Church of the poor. The objective of the diocesan priesthood is the formation of the Catholic community within which it works into a perfect Church of this description. All of the ministry of the diocesan priesthood is meant by God to be expended for the attainment of this immediate end. All of the resources of learning and spirituality which God gives to the diocesan priest must be employed for this definite purpose. And, since the attainment of this purpose demands an effective sympathy and union with the poor of Jesus Christ, this is the immediate commission of the *presbyterium*.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[40] This passage is contained in "Primitive Christianity," published in *Historical Sketches* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1920), I, 341 f. It is to be found in Harrold's edition of Newman's *Essays and Sketches* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1948), I, 87.

Answers to Questions

THE TRIPLE CANDLE ON HOLY SATURDAY

Question: What is the origin and the meaning of the triple candle used in the services on Holy Saturday? It is lighted, one branch at a time, during the procession from the vestibule to the altar, early in the ceremonies and the Paschal candle is lighted from it and then we hear no more about it.

Answer: The use of the triple candle, mounted on a rod (*arundo*), is not very ancient. It dates back no farther than the twelfth century and appears in the twelfth and fourteenth Roman *Ordines,* which are respectively of the late twelfth century and the early fourteenth. While it is tempting to see in the triple candle a symbol of the Unity and Trinity of God, since it is a single candle with three branches, this significance can be attached to it only after its adoption. Its origin appears to be prosaic and utilitarian. The three intertwined tapers are a protection against the danger of the new fire, just kindled, being blown out by a sudden gust of wind. A single flame could be readily blown out. A double light, which was used in some places, cannot so easily be extinguished and a triple flame is a still better precaution. In this connection, it may be remarked that the more correct form of the arrangement of the three-fold candle is not the trident, as is usually seen, but a triangular formation of the branches. The rubric of the Missal reads as follows: "Cum tribus candelis in summitate illius (arundinis) *triangulo distinctis.*"

PRAYING ALOUD AT THE ELEVATIONS

Question: Is it against any prescription of the Church to have the children and the people pray aloud during the elevation of the Sacred Host and of the Chalice? If so, what prayers should be said? A survey among my parishioners revealed that very few said any prayers at the elevations, merely bowing their heads.

Answer: There is no definite legislation as to what the faithful should do at the moment of elevation. Since the Sacred Host and the Chalice are elevated that they may be seen by the people, it

would appear that they should look at the Sacred Species when they are raised up. A growing practice is that of bowing during the Consecration and then raising the head to look on the Host and the Chalice as they are lifted up.

Concerning prayers to be said at the elevation, there is an indulgence to be gained by the faithful who, at the elevation of the Host, recite this ejaculation: "My Lord and my God" (*Raccolta*, 107). Nothing is said about any similar prayer at the elevation of the Chalice nor is there any direction that one must look at the Sacred Host when pronouncing the words. As to prayer aloud, it seems to us incongrous as we have long been accustomed to silence, broken only by the tinkling of the bell. However, there is no law commanding such quiet.

WEARING THE CHASUBLE OVER THE SURPLICE

Question: I have been told that it is correct for priests to vest in surplice and chasuble to take part in the Corpus Christi procession. This seems very strange. I thought that the chasuble could not be worn except at Mass and then naturally over the alb.

Answer: Surprising as the practice may be to our questioner, it is quite correct to vest in surplice and chasuble in the case of a priest who assists in sacred vestments at the Corpus Christi procession. The *Caeremoniale episcoporum* (II, xxxiii, 5) directs that for this procession canons wear the vestments proper to their order, dignitaries in copes, canons of the order of priests in chasubles, and canons of the order of deacons or subdeacons in dalmatics. In each case, the vestment is worn over the surplice (or rochet) and the amice. Where a chapter of canons does not take part, as in this country, the clergy present may be divided into groups wearing these vestments (S.R.C., 2362 *ad* 1). Our Baltimore Ceremonial (Part III, Chap. VI, Art. 2) makes the same provision.

Only when the wearer is the officiant or the deacon, subdeacon, or cross-bearer, is the chasuble or dalmatic to be worn with the alb. Although the custom in the United States is different, strictly speaking the deacons at the throne at Pontifical Mass should wear their dalmatics over surplices and not over albs. Such a combination may look a bit strange to some but it is a practice commonly

to be seen abroad, when chapters of canons appear in sacred vestments at pontifical functions and cardinals wear copes, chasubles, and dalmatics over their rochets in Papal processions.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

PUBLIC MASS FOR NON-CATHOLICS

Question: Canon 2262, § 2,2, forbids the celebration of Mass for an excommunicated person unless it take place privately; and if he is a *vitandus* the intention may be only for his conversion. Does it follow from this that one may not celebrate Mass publicly for the conversion of non-Catholics?

Answer: It would seem that if Mass is to be offered for the conversion of an individual heretic, schismatic, or apostate, the function must be private—that is, without any external pomp or public announcement. For baptized non-Catholics are treated in law as excommunicated persons. However, since they are not in the category of *excommunicati vitandi,* there is no reason why the Holy Sacrifice may not be offered privately, not only for their conversion, but also for their other spiritual and temporal needs—e.g., for peace of soul, recovery of health (Cf. Cappello, *De sacramentis* [Rome, 1938], I, n.618). Unbaptized non-Catholics cannot be excommunicated persons; hence, *per se* Mass could be offered for them publicly. However, *per secidens,* because of the danger of scandal, this should not be done ordinarily (cf. Damen, *Theologia moralis* [Turin, 1947], II, n. 193). But these rules evidently are concerned primarily with the application of the Holy Sacrifice for determined individuals. There would seem to be no objection to the public offering of Mass for the conversion of heretics, schismatics, and apostates and infidels, in general. Indeed, one of the votive Masses in the Missal is directed to the removal of schism.

THE BLESSING OF A GRAVE IN A NON-CATHOLIC CEMETERY

Question: One day recently a woman came to our rectory, in a southern town, and requested that a priest bless the grave in a

non-Catholic cemetery in which her husband was to be buried on the following day. He was a convert who had lived and died in a northern city, and had there received the funeral rites of the Church. His non-Catholic relatives reside in our town, and it was in their family plot that he was to be buried. However, for the consolation of the relatives, his wife had made arrangements to have the burial ceremony conducted by a Protestant clergyman. This procedure had been approved by a priest in the northern city, who had told her: "We are living at a time when there are many mixed marriages, and through them Catholic and non-Catholic families come into close contact. We must, therefore, be generous, and concede all we can for the consolation of the non-Catholic relatives of a deceased Catholic." Should the priest have blessed that grave?

Answer: The Third Plenary Council of Baltimore decreed that when converts are buried in a non-Catholic cemetery in which their non-Catholic relatives have a family plot, the usual rites of Christian burial are to be granted them unless the bishop, for serious reasons, has forbidden this; and moreover, that the grave is to be blessed (nn. 317-18). The case presented by the questioner would seem therefore, to fulfil the conditions required to justify the blessing of the grave. However, in this particular case an important circumstance must be taken into consideration—the fact that a non-Catholic minister had been invited to conduct the burial rites on the following day. Because of the scandal which would almost inevitably follow when it became publicly known that a priest had blessed a grave over which heretical services were to be conducted on the morrow, I believe that the priest should have refused to bless the grave. It is to be regretted that the chief cause of the introduction of non-Catholic services into the burial was not the widow but the priest who gave the strange advice quoted above.

PRESENCE AT NON-CATHOLIC SERVICES

Question: Is friendship a sufficient title to justify passive attendance at a non-Catholic funeral or wedding, in view of the fact that the Code (Can. 1258, § 2) requires "a grave reason, *civilis officii vel honoris causa*"?

Answer: The mere fact that a Catholic has had a slight ac-

quaintance with the non-Catholic whose marriage or funeral is taking place in a non-Catholic church is not a sufficient reason to justify the Catholic's attendance at the function. But intimate and long-standing friendship would be a sufficient reason, provided there is no danger of scandal or of perversion. The phrase *honoris causa* can be reasonably interpreted to include the expression of honor which we naturally wish to manifest to our intimate friends, especially on the occasion of a marriage or a funeral. Bouscaren-Ellis translate the phrase given by the questioner as "for the sake of civil courtesy, duty or respect, for a grave reason" (*Canon Law* [Milwaukee, 1946], p. 639). It should be remembered that under no circumstances may a Catholic participate *actively* in any public non-Catholic religious service.

INDULGENCE FOR VISITING THE BLESSED SACRAMENT

Question: In order to gain an indulgence for visiting the Blessed Sacrament, may doctors and nurses who work in a Catholic hospital but do not live there make the visit in the semi-public oratory of the hospital?

Answer: The Code decrees that, for the gaining of an indulgence which requires a visit to a *church* or to a *public oratory,* those who dwell habitually in a school or hospital or similar institution which has no church or public oratory attached to it may satisfy the requirement by a visit to the domestic chapel, where they can satisfy their obligation of hearing Mass (Can. 929). Accordingly, the doctors and nurses to whom the questioner refers could not satisfy the condition of "a visit to a church or public oratory" by visiting the oratory of the hospital (presumably semi-public), because they do not reside habitually in the institution. But it is different when there is question of gaining an indulgence for a visit to the *Blessed Sacrament*—at least, if it is not prescribed that this visit must be made in a church or public oratory. In this supposition, there is no reason why the indulgence cannot be gained by any person in a semi-public oratory—or, for that matter, even in a private oratory, if the Blessed Sacrament is present there. For example, one who devoutly visits the Blessed Sacrament and recites five times the Our Father, Hail Mary, and Gloria, with an added Our

Father, Hail Mary and Gloria for the Pope, can gain an indulgence of ten years; and if this devotion is performed daily for a week, a plenary indulgence can be gained under the usual conditions (*Preces et pia opera,* n. 121). The doctors and nurses in question could make the visits to the Blessed Sacrament, stipulated for this indulgence, in the hospital chapel; but if they wished to gain the plenary indulgence after a week of daily visits, they would have to visit a church or public oratory and pray for the intention of the Pope (e.g., one Our Father, Hail Mary, and Gloria), since these, with confession and Holy Communion, are the "usual conditions."

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for July, 1899, the leading article, signed "A Close Observer," is an account of some recent schismatic movements in the United States. The writer relates the organization of schismatic congregations, by priests who had received episcopal consecration from non-Catholic bishops, in Chicago and in Buffalo. The greater part of the article, however, is devoted to an account of the activities of Joseph Vilatte, who organized an Old Catholic church near Green Bay, Wisconsin, received episcopal consecration from a schismatic bishop in India, and ordained others to the priesthood and episcopate. But in 1899 he returned to the Catholic Church. . . . Fr. L. A. Dutto gives an interesting account of the labors of Fr. Eusebio Kino, S.J., a missionary priest of the seventeenth century, who worked for many years among the Indians of Arizona. . . . In the *Analecta,* the Bull of Pope Leo XIII promulgating the Holy Year for 1900 appears in both Latin and English. . . . The Encyclical Letter of the same Sovereign Pontiff is also given, wherein he orders a solemn triduum in preparation for the Feast of the Sacred Heart and the Act of Consecration, newly composed, for the Feast itself. . . . In the Conference section there is a denunciation of the dangerous "chain prayers" which were evidently being widely circulated. . . . Writing on the subject of catechisms, a priest-correspondent asserts: "It is a well-known fact that nearly every priest in the United States has found fault with the Baltimore Catechism; but we all, in the spirit of obedience, cast aside our Butler's and our Boston, and our other excellent catechisms, to make our little ones learn incomprehensible definitions."

F.J.C.

Analecta

The January, 1949, issue of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* reports the radio message delivered by our Holy Father on Christmas Eve 1948.[1] Its central theme was the insistence that the precept of peace derives from the divine law and that its purpose is the protection of the goods of humanity inasmuch as they are gifts of the Creator. His Holiness insisted that among these gifts there are some of such importance for society that it is perfectly lawful to defend them against aggression; more, that the defense of them is even an obligation for the nations as a whole, which have a duty not to abandon a nation that is attacked. The certainty that this duty will not go unfulfilled will serve to discourage the aggressor, our Holy Father affirmed. In this way, he averred, there will be realized the best means of fulfilling the dictum, "To assure peace prepare for war," and even of that other dictum, "Peace at all costs"; two policies that would otherwise be adverse and both of which, in the absence of the realization of the divine precept of defense against aggression and of a sincere Christian will for peace with which the fulfillment of that precept is undertaken, would undoubtedly and inescapably lead to the war they aim to prevent.

The declaration of excommunication, issued Dec. 28, 1948, and reported in the same number of the *Acta*,[2] was followed in the subsequent number of the *Acta*[3] by a report of the later declaration, issued Feb. 12, 1949, both aimed at the persecutors of the Church in Hungary. Specially reserved excommunication and legal infamy were specified as the penalties incurred by the criminals involved. The latter declaration referred specifically to canon 2209, §§ 1-3, to emphasize the fact that these penalties equally affected all the conspirators.

On Jan. 2, 1949,[4] our Holy Father addressed a letter to the Hierarchy of Hungary, consoling them in the loss sustained through the arrest of His Eminence, Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty, reminding them of the loyalty of their ancestors in the face of persecution, and urging them to perseverance in prayer, even for their enemies, in order that a better day might ensue for their beloved nation.

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLI (1949), 5.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 80.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

Our Holy Father went on record in protest against the farcical trial of Cardinal Mindszenty in an allocution addressed to the Cardinals in a secret consistory on Feb. 14, 1949;[5] in another, addressed to the diplomatic corps, on Feb. 16, 1949;[6] and in a third, addressed to the multitudes assembled in front of St. Peter's, on Feb. 20, 1949.[7] In the last of these he eloquently painted a picture of the kind of Church the totalitarians would grant a precarious toleration and asked whether such a Church was the Church they loved. That kind of Church is unthinkable, and such the Pope could not permit the Church of Christ to be.

In connection with the same issue, our Holy Father delivered an allocution to the universal hierarchy, dated Feb. 11, 1949,[8] in which he urged the reception of Holy Communion by all the faithful on Passion Sunday, April 3, and in which he permitted all priests to celebrate a second Mass on that day for the remission of sins. On the following day,[9] the Sacred Congregation of Rites issued a decree directing that the priests making use of this concession should, in celebrating the first of the two Masses, use the Proper of the Passion, adding a commemoration for the Pape in honor of the golden jubilee of his ordination; and, in celebrating the second Mass, the Proper of the Votive Mass for the Remission of Sins, with the Creed and the Preface of the Passion, but without commemoration of the Sunday; while, in celebrating only one Mass, the commemoration of the Votive Mass should be added under one conclusion of the Oration of the Sunday, and the commemoration for the Pope said as the second Oration.

On Dec. 24, 1948,[10] our Holy Father sent a letter to Most Rev. John T. McNicholas, O.P., S.T.M., Archbishop of Cincinnati, praising the work of the hierarchy and the faithful of the United States in behalf of the admission of displaced persons but urging continued effort in the direction of unimpeded immigration privileges.

A letter of Dec. 4, 1948,[11] addressed to the Minister General of the Capuchins, blessed the Institute's recently adopted plans for the extension of its apostolate; a letter of Dec. 8, 1948,[12] sent to His Eminence, Theodore Cardinal Innitzer, Archbishop of Vienna,

[5] *Ibid.*, p. 41.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 73.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 74.
[8] *Ibid.*, p. 58.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 82.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 69.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 64.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 67.

offered our Holy Father's best wishes for the occasion of the inauguration of divine service in the Cathedral of St. Stephen in Vienna and authorized His Eminence at the end of the Pontifical Mass to confer on the assembled people the Apostolic Blessing with a plenary indulgence attached.

The twenty-fifth anniversary of the foundation of the University of Nijmegen offered our Holy Father the opportunity of extending to it his congratulations through a letter dated Aug. 6, 1948.[13]

Other letters of congratulations marked respectively the golden jubilee of the ordination of His Eminence, Emmanuel Celestine Cardinal Suhard, Archbishop of Paris (under date of Nov. 20, 1948);[14] the fiftieth anniversary of Monsignor Perosi as Director of the Sistine Choir (under date of Dec. 15, 1948);[15] and the fiftieth anniversary of the ordination of Fr. Matteo Crowley-Boevey, SS. CC. (under date of July 11, 1948).[16]

His Eminence, Clemente Cardinal Micara, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, was appointed, by a letter of Jan. 6, 1949,[17] Apostolic Legate to the Bolivarian Eucharistic Congress held in Cali, Colombia. At the end of the Congress our Holy Father addressed the assembled delegates in a radio message delivered Jan. 30, 1949.[18]

Apostolic Constitutions are published in the first two 1949 numbers of the *Acta* in virtue of which territorial adjustments are authorized among various ecclesiastical subdivisions. A Constitution of May 20, 1948,[19] established the Diocese of Karachi from territory withdrawn from the Archdiocese of Bombay; another Constitution, dated July 15, 1948,[20] established the Apostolic Vicariate of Los Rios (*Fluminensis*) in Ecuador from territory withdrawn from the Diocese of Guayaquil; and a third Constitution, dated July 17, 1948,[21] established the Diocese of St. Paul in Alberta from territory withdrawn from the Archdiocese of Edmonton.

Three Apostolic Letters conferred the rank of Minor Basilica on three important churches: one, dated April 25, 1946,[22] conferred the rank on the Collegiate Church of the Assumption in Gallarate in the Archdiocese of Milan; a second, dated May 24, 1948,[23] on

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 26.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 27.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 68.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 24.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 71.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 76.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 62.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 16.
[21] *Ibid.*, p. 18.
[22] *Ibid.*, p. 21.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 22.

the Cathedral of St. Julian (Bishop of Le Mans) in the Diocese of Caltagirone; and a third, dated Sept. 23, 1948,[24] on the Parish Church of St. John the Baptist in the City and the Diocese of Lecce.

Under a decree datd Jan. 28, 1949,[25] effective March 2, 1949, the Sacred Congregation of the Council restricted the faculties regarding dispensations from the law of fast and abstinence granted bishops by the Apostolic Indult of Dec. 19, 1941. The decree forbids dispensations from the obligation of abstinence on Fridays and from that of fasting and abstinence on the vigils of the Feast of the Assumption and of Christmas. Under the previous faculties the restriction extended to the law of fasting and abstinence on Ash Wednesday and Good Friday and this restriction is effective also under the new decree. A similar decree was issued on the same date[26] by the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church; for the faithful of the Byzantine Rite the restriction affecting the vigil of Christmas was replaced in the latter decree by a restriction affecting the vigil of the Feast of the Epiphany.

By a decree of Oct. 21, 1948,[27] clerics were forbidden to go to Australia or New Zealand from the countries of Europe without written permission of the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith under penalty of automatic suspension *a divinis*. However, an exception was made in favor of clerics leaving English-speaking countries. In their case, it sufficed that their own bishops would have the assurance of the bishop in Australia or New Zealand that the cleric would be welcome in the diocese of the latter.

A decree of the same Sacred Congregation, dated July 8, 1948,[28] changed the name of the recently established Apostolic Prefecture of Lake Moëri in the Belgian Congo; the new name is the Prefecture of Lulua. Another decree of this Sacred Congregation, dated Jan. 13, 1949,[29] changed the name of an Apostolic Vicariate in South Africa from Great Namaqualand to Keetmanshoop.

Under date of Dec. 17, 1948,[30] the Sacred Consistorial Congregation published the appointment of Most Rev. William A. O'Connor, D.D., as Bishop of Springfield in Illinois; and of Most Rev. William E. Cousins, D.D., as Auxiliary of His Eminence, Samuel Cardinal Stritch, Archbishop of Chicago.

[24] *Ibid.*, p. 23.
[25] *Ibid.*, p. 32.
[26] *Ibid.*, p. 31.
[27] *Ibid.*, p. 34.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 33.
[29] *Ibid.*, p. 82.
[30] *Ibid.*, p. 81.

Under date of June 25, 1948, the Sacred Congregation of Rites provided for the reassumption of the causes of two beatified Polish priest members of the Friars Minor, i.e., Blessed John of Dukla[31] and Blessed Simon of Lipnica.[32] On Dec. 19, 1948,[33] the same Sacred Congregation issued a decree accepting the miracles required for the canonization of Blessed Jeanne of Valois, once Queen of France and Foundress of the Order of the Annunciation.

RECENT PONTIFICAL APPOINTMENTS ANNOUNCED IN THE ACTA APOSTOLICAE SEDIS

Protonotaries Apostolic ad instar participantium:

June 11, 1947: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Lucien J. Caillouet, of the Archdiocese of New Orleans.

March 3, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgr. John C. McClary, of the Archdiocese of Newark.

Oct. 11, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Peter O'Malley, of the Archdiocese of Dubuque.

May 30, 1948: Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas F. Galligan, of the Diocese of Davenport.

JEROME D. HANNAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 35.
[32] *Ibid.*, p. 36.
[33] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

THE POWER OF THE PRIESTHOOD

How singular, how holy, how great is this power! The divine right of kings is nothing as compared with the divine right of the priesthood. Descent from ancient princes, from conquering tribes, from great nations, is nothing as compared with the priestly descent from Jesus Christ. The power of life and death is not to be compared with the power of restoring life to the souls of men. No work is so noble as that of co-operating with the Saviour of the world in His great office of atonement, saving sinners and glorifying the Father. No science is so important as that which the priesthood have to teach all nations. What sanctity befits that state! Pray God to multiply and sanctify His ministers, to give power to their words and success to their endeavours, for the glory of His holy name.

—The Right Rev. James Bellord, in *Meditations on Christian Dogma* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1948), II, 327.

Book Reviews

COME, FOLLOW ME! The Following of Christ Adapted for Use in Mental Prayer. By B. F. Marcetteau, S.S. Vol. II, Milwaukee: Bruce Publishing Co., 1947. Pp. xiv + 306. $3.50.

When the theory of social progress ceases to be one of the absolutes, its disillusioned victim often retreats into the past and develops a new respect for the classics of his tradition. Cut off from ready communion with them by lapse of time and by changes of scene and pace and idiom he creates a nostalgic market for *compendiosa doctrina.* And the basic this and the portable that and the essentials of something else are tailored to his inadequacies and are rushed in to fill the void in his complacency. Fr. Marcetteau's adaptation could not on the score of subject matter alone be addressed to the drug store trade and it is too careful a work on other counts to be grouped easily with the typical quicky. It is therefore all the more striking a witness to the confidence of publishers in the current rebirth of classics.

The rewrite man has one of the most thankless jobs on a daily American newspaper. But when he transfers his ministrations from the scattered distractions of the passing show to the confines of a well-established classic (or to a version of it which has become a classic) especially to a classic which both in the Latin and in the Challoner version of it once enjoyed so wide an audience that it still commands glib lip-service in the exchanges of the correctly informed, his task becomes risky and self-effacing. It calls for a nice balance between the claims of the original and the needs and capacities of the public for whom it is intended. And it invites the barbs of pedants and purists who are always automatically outraged at any piece of plastic surgery performed on an accepted and high-placed original. A work of this sort cannot be done well without an enormous expenditure of time. It may call for a scale of effort that approaches the dimensions of co-authorship, but when the adaptation is published, it is still the original which must hold the center of the stage.

The extent and variety of Fr. Marcetteau's labors on Books III and IV of the *Imitation* are not to be discovered at a glance. He has not made a translation *de novo* from the original Latin, as the publishers unfortunately imply on the jacket. He has been modest enough to undertake what was probably a more time-consuming task—to revise the English of the Challoner with the definitive Latin text as a guide. This procedure might distress some philologists, but it is well to remember the long and generally well-deserved authority of the Challoner and the

fact that the Latin text of the *Imitation* not only enjoys the more usual benefits of modern textual criticism but is supported by that rarest of coincidences for a Latin classic—an extant codex made and inscribed by the author himself. It is characteristic of the editor and thoroughly in keeping with the spirit of Thomas à Kempis to pass up this point in silence, to refuse to be distracted by the centuries-long quarrel as to who wrote the *Imitation,* to forego the temptation of the learned prolegomena and of multiple footnotes. Moreover he has not seen fit to tamper with over-all features. There is the same number of chapters as in the Challoner version, they are presented in the same sequence, and the chapter-headings in their new English dress reflect the Challoner faithfully. But when the chapters are looked at individually, the differences begin to appear.

The editor has kept to his purpose of reworking the *Imitation* into a modern book of meditation and in a modern English version of Thomas' own words. But not all his words by any means. He has had to rescue Thomas from his repetitiousness by frequent and sometimes large deletions and from his lack of system by generous additions and courageous transpositions. Words, phrases, paragraphs, and pages have had to be dropped in the process and the editor's own introductions and conclusions have had to be inserted. Sometimes the words of Thomas (thus translated) occupy most of a given meditation. More often they do not. And throughout the editor has had to insert his own sub-headings to bring the outpourings of Thomas into easy control, and his own examinations and resolutions to point them up. He could not be completely systematic in all this since Thomas is so unsystematic but by continuous re-adaptation of his devices to the emergencies as they arose, he has succeeded in imposing order and system on one who carried his disapproval of contemporary scholasticism to the point of glorying in the absence of system. The result is a rich book of piety in which the familiar, colloquial style of the original is carried over faithfully into up-to-date English and the interpolations of the editor have the authority of a long maturity in the daily practice of meditation.

Fr. Marcetteau has been able to present so much of his author unaltered because there is so little of specific reference to the contemporary world in the *Imitation.* Such barbs as "contentious discourses," "noise of words," "clash of arguments," "pretentious display" are pointed enough if one recalls the decadent scholasticism which evoked them, but Thomas never names names. And so these phrases survive as castigations of a persistent vice of scholarship rather than as protests against a particular example of the vice. And Fr. Marcetteau does not diminish the resultant universality of the *Imitation* by nailing it down through footnotes to particular occasions.

As a conscientious editor, however, he has his problems with Thomas' other worldliness. For Thomas, like the typical mystic, seems to have no social awareness. When we are confronted, for instance, by such declarations as (p. 142) "if you have recourse to the ever living and abiding truth, you will not be grieved when a friend departs or dies" and (p. 143) "you ought to be so detached . . . from persons who are dear to you as to desire, in so far as depends on you, to live without any human companionship," some of us are not helped very much by either the text or its context. For in the ecclesiastical state it is often easy enough to develop such attitudes without stirring from the boundaries of self-love. The editor, in his loyalty, tries to save the day here by confining his remarks to "inordinate affection," but such was not the intent of uncompromising Thomas. And does not the editor himself overstate the case when he leads off a meditation on detachment (p. 148) with the assertion "we never see Him [i.e. Our Lord] take any interest in the things of this world. . ."?

The typical man who will profit from the *Imitation* today does not dwell in a fifteenth century monastery either in fact or in spirit but in the midst of a crowded life, professionally and avocationally, whether he dwell within or without the cloister. He will not find a complete answer are, as always, in this book. For without the preliminary preus in Thomas' world-fleeing exhortations but the beginnings of the answer are ,as always, in this book. For without the preliminary preoccupation between the soul and Our Lord which the *Imitation* is dedicated to fostering, little which in the long run will be effective can be done by the individual for society. Even Thomas, it seems, had to break from his contemporaries on Mount Saint Agnes to engage in those communions with the divine which issued in a classic which ranked for centuries next to the Bible in spiritual influence and which Fr. Marcetteau's self-abnegating labors launch on a new career of usefulness.

J. M. CAMPBELL

SACRED HISTORY. By Daniel-Rops. Translated by K. Madge. New York: Longmans, Green and Co. 1949. Pp. xii+433. $4.50.

According to the jacket of this book, the purpose of its author was to recount the story of Israel up to the time of Christ, especially in its contacts with the great neighboring civilizations. This object has, on the whole, been well attained. Daniel-Rops gives us here the history of the Chosen People from Abraham, or even from Adam, down to Christ, with much space devoted to the histories and cultures of Mesopotamia, Egypt, Canaan, etc. The work is well developed and written in an interesting manner.

The author, however, is primarily a litterateur, not an expert Biblical

scholar nor a specialist in the ancient Near East. Hence, not a few of his statements are based on rather poor exegesis or show a misunderstanding of the findings of Near Eastern archaeology. This is particularly noticeable in the early chapters where the outmoded "high" chronology is followed throughout. Thus, Sargon of Akkad is here dated to c. 3000 B.C., Gudea of Lagash to the twenty-fifth century B.C., and Hammurabi of Babylon to c. 2000 B.C. These dates are from five to at least two centuries too high. This error is only in part due to the fact that the original French work was first published in 1943, when the new "low" chronology was but recently established; the author admits in a footnote (p. 28) that he is acquainted with this new chronology, which is now held by almost all competent scholars, but he prefers to be old-fashioned (perhaps to avoid rewriting a good part of his work).

Minor errors and inaccuracies are unfortunately rather numerous in this book. Thus, to cite but a few examples, the author says that "human sacrifice was practised" at Ur in the time of Abraham (p. 12), although the only evidence he can adduce for this astonishing statement is the burial of many slaves together with their deceased king or queen in the First Dynasty of Ur—a good thousand years before Abraham's time! Again, according to Daniel-Rops, Abraham's decision to leave Ur was perhaps due in part to Hammurabi's "insupportable political tyranny, that totalitarianism" (p. 14). The fact that the author wrote this while France was suffering from Nazi despotism is no reason to so malign that eminently just ruler of Babylon. As a matter of fact, Mesopotamia was always far less "totalitarian" than Egypt.

Some of the absurd slips may be due to the translator, such as, "The Book of Proverbs, sometimes called the 'Wisdom of Solomon'" (p. 209), or, "Malachi and Jesus, sons of Sirach" (p. 395), or that really precious item, "Solomon bought horses in Egypt and Silesia" (p. 197—"Silesia" in eastern Germany instead of "Cilicia" in southeast Asia Minor). The roles of Assyria and Babylon are completely inverted in the sentence: "Assyria was occupied by an Aramaean prince, Merodach-Baladan, who, from near the Persian Gulf, was threatening Babylon" (p. 259). The translator seems to be confusing two different meanings of the French word "droite" in saying that the name Benjamin means "the son of righteousness" (p. 39) instead of "the son of the right hand." Yet the author himself may be guilty of this mistake, since he proposes so many other fantastic interpretations of Hebrew personal names.

From the viewpoint of Catholic doctrine there is hardly anything to quarrel with in this book. The author consistently follows the tradition-

al interpretations of the Old Testament; in fact, at times he is over-conservative in his opinions. In the few places where he seems to favor rationalistic ideas, as in the question of the Song of Songs (p. 210), he hastens to correct himself in a footnote. The last page notes that the original work "carried the authorization of the ecclesiastical authorities of the Archbishopric of Paris." Yet this English version of it bears no *Imprimatur*—perhaps because the translator, for no good reason, decided to use the antiquated and often obscure King James Version for direct quotations from the Bible.

The general public, for whom this work was written, will find here an interesting account of how God prepared the world for the coming of the divine Saviour. And the author deserves our thanks for inducing his readers to have recourse to the basic source itself and to peruse with greater diligence and deeper meditation God's own account of these events in the Old Testament itself.

LOUIS HARTMAN, C.SS.R.

INTRODUCTION TO REALISTIC PHILOSOPHY. By John Wild. New York: Harper and Bros., 1948. Pp. xi—516, with index and glossary of technical terms. $4.50.

It is refreshing to find an author in these days of so much esoteric philosophizing, stating boldly that every man is a philosopher—since every man has a way of looking at life. He might have added that even the man who carefully avoids having any view does not escape. To be human is to have some sort of philosophy. The only question is what kind it will be—for the varieties of philosophy are legion. None can be said to comprehend truth completely and none has been without some element of truth—which should astonish no one, when it is remembered that truth is the natural object of the intellect and that philosophy is not the pinnacle of science but the handmaid to revealed theology.

What is especially attractive about this contribution of Harvard's leading realist is that he is writing to restore philosophy to its owners. Professional philosophers are useful, just as are physicians. But physicians exist to keep living men healthy; so philosophical specialists ought to exist to keep philosophy vital and accessible to those who need it. And who need it? Dr. Wild answers simply: the common man. "The academic discipline exists solely for the purpose of purifying and refining that natural philosophy of the common man which is a necessary part of human life" (p. 3).

With this in mind, the author has produced a book for the student and general reader. He offers it as an introduction to the basic concepts

and principles of the classical realistic tradition, including Plato, Aristotle, Augustine and Thomas Aquinas.

Though Dr. Wild has aimed at an introductory text, he admits its difficulty. "I have tried to avoid unduly abstract language and to achieve simplicity of expression. But it is impossible, I believe, to familiarize the student with classical thought without at the same time trying to make him at home with its technical terminology" (p. x). Such honesty inspires confidence. One gets weary of hearing critics complain that we do not treat philosophy so that anybody can understand it. What they are really saying is that they want a science, and this is especially true of scholastic philosophy, delicate and complicated, of long traditions and diversified origins, simplified to the mental challenge of the sport sheet or comic strip. This cannot be done for philosophy any more than for any other science.

On the other hand some philosophers evidence too little concern for clarity and the reader's background. On this score Dr. Wild deserves congratulations. Take for example his explanation of substance and accident (p. 324):

> If something is to achieve an added perfection or accident it must already exist without the addition. Furthermore it must exist throughout the process by which the new perfection is gained. Otherwise it will not be changed. Finally, it must continue to exist after the accident has been gained without ceasing to be what it was. Otherwise it will not be perfected. The same will hold good for those privative processes by which something loses a perfection or accident. A thing can exist with or without the accidents which it supports. This should enable us to understand the realistic definition of substance which expresses its essential nature: *that which is capable of existing in itself.* A star, a tree, a human individual are substances. On the other hand, there are many entities, like circular shape or greenish color which, though they are able to exist, cannot exist in themselves but only in something else. These are accidents. An accident may therefore be precisely defined as: *that which is capable of existing in something other than itself.*

Dr. Wild does not cover the entire field of realistic philosophy. He takes this to stand for the real existence of a world which man does not make but discovers. He holds this world to be naturally knowable and the only true basis for the knowledge man needs to live as a personal and social being. The emphasis of the book is upon ethics (part one) and the philosophy of nature (part two)—though in use the order may be reversed. The author's philosophy of nature is not simply cosmology. In considering change, Dr. Wild investigates the first cause of change, and so takes up the arguments for the existence and nature of the First Cause. Likewise, in dealing with philosophical anthropology, which covers a good half of the second part of the work, he touches on the problems of knowledge usually found in general psychology.

With the exception, then, of metaphysics, which Dr. Wild thought too difficult, and logic, which he thought needless, the author surveys the field of the traditional philosophy fairly well. From a qualitative view, too, he has succeeded. No one could attempt what Dr. Wild proposes and fancy the results to be perfect. But his achievement measured against the book's vast objective gives plentiful evidence that the author has produced a reliable, readable, informative, practical, and physically attractive book.

The selection of Plato, Aristotle, Augustine and Aquinas as representatives of realistic philosophy may raise a question. There is no doubt, of course, about the interlacing of thought in these philosophers and saints. Aristotle was not the antagonist of Plato, and Aquinas' reliance upon, and admiration for, Augustine can be easily verified. The convergence of these four thinkers in Aquinas' Christian synthesis is also indisputable. Yet among the four of them there are important divergences, which some might think irreconcilable. But Dr. Wild does not try to build up a composite philosophy. While this might seem implied in the introduction, the book is its own best evidence that the author has followed the lead of the Peripetics.

Introduction to Realistic Philosophy deserves a warm welcome by all interested in philosophical truth. Unfortunately, those who need it most will probably not read it. The very names of Aristotle and Augustine and Aquinas are enough to repulse some contemporary champions of unprejudiced philosophical thinking. Men who call requests for definitions nonsense questions are not likely to expose themselves to any great amount of Aristotle and St. Thomas.

Even though the book does not enter the domains of positivism and the idealism and pragmatism which are so dominant, it ought still to have a large audience. There are still human beings of intelligence and integrity who feel that there is such a thing as truth and that the best products of the greatest thinkers, tested and retested down the ages, challenged and rechallenged by more changes of culture than can be enumerated, may have something still to offer our own desperate world. Man was made for truth, and truth is all about him. His love for truth is a measure of his love of self; for his highest perfection is attaining truth and ultimately Truth Itself, supreme and creative and illuminating and perfectly satisfying. This high vocation is the vocation of all men—not of a few specialists. That we have here a book which recognizes this fact and has tried to restore the *philosophia perennis* to those who should never have lost it, is a source of great satisfaction. May it outstrip the author's highest hopes and bring men back to the great

philosophical classics and the great classical philosophers, who without any modern peer brought man to know himself and revealed the First Cause of all in all He had made.

JOSEPH B. MCALLISTER

SECOND LATIN. By Cora Carroll Scanlon and Charles L. Scanlon. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Company, 1948. Pp. 270. $3.50.

Many who have heard the call to the priesthood after completing a High School course in Latin will find this book very helpful. The book presupposes a thorough study of Latin grammar. It is intended for the student preparing to begin his theological studies from the text books written in Latin. The vocabulary and exercises have been prepared with this purpose in view. The end of this volume contains 3000 words frequently met in textbooks of Philosophy, Theology and Canon Law. *Second Latin* consists of forty lessons each with a vocabulary, word study, a section of Latin Grammar and a Latin exercise for translation.

For the most part the constructions correspond to the usages in classical Latin. However, the book allows some constructions that would not be found in the best classical authors. It gives the student a general review of the main points of Latin syntax. If more space had been given to Latin grammar, more material could have been covered to the greater profit of the student. The book would have gained much by a more systematic arrangement of the material. Thus, if all the prepositions were treated in one section, all the usages of the subjunctive in another, and so forth, the work would be a much better ready reference book for the student. In a book such as *Second Latin* an *index rerum verborum et locutionum* is almost indispensable. Such an index is lacking in this edition. *Second Latin* will be useful to exservicemen and others with belated vocations who need a "refresher course" Latin syntax before starting their theological studies. Religious who spend a year in their novitiate, out of contact with Latin studies, will also find the book helpful as they begin their course of studies in the seminary.

JOHN G. BARRY

WHAT IS THIS CATHOLIC ACTION? By Rev. Francis B. Donnelly. New York: America Press, 1948. Pp. 96.

What is This Catholic Action? is a small but superior contribution to American readers (particularly, though not solely, the American clergy), on a most important subject.